This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

**Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

**About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

*rish Churches*

N 36

יהוה

INSTITVTIO THEOLOGICA
ANDOVER FVNDATA MDCCCVII
Ps. CXIX. 169.
כד ברך
תבינכי
JOH. XVII. 17.
ὁ λογος
σος
αληθεια
ἐστι.
ΑΚΡΟΓΩΝΙ
ΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ

## NEW THEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS.

***Words of Hope from the Pulpit of the Temple*** Church. By C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D., Master of the Temple. Crown 8vo. Price 5s. Second Edition.
[*Just out.*

***The Young Life Equipping itself for God's Service.*** Being Four Sermons Preached before the University of Cambridge in November 1872. By the Rev. C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D., Master of the Temple. Crown 8vo. Price 3s. 6d.

"Has all the writer's characteristics of devotedness, purity, and high moral tone."—*London Quarterly Review.*

"As earnest, eloquent, and as liberal as everything else that he writes."—*Examiner.*

"Earnest in tone and eloquent in entreaty."—*Manchester Examiner.*

***Hartham Conferences; or, Discussions upon some*** of the Religious Subjects of the Day. By the Rev. F. W. KINGSFORD, M.A., Vicar of St Thomas, Stamford Hill, late Chaplain H.E.I.C. (Bengal Presidency). Crown 8vo, limp cloth. Price 3s. 6d.
[*Just out.*

LONDON: HENRY S. KING & CO.

## NOW PUBLISHING.

***Studies in Modern Problems.*** A Series of Essays by various Writers. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A.

This project secures the supervision of a small number of Clergy and Laity formed of representative men in London, at both Universities, and in the Provinces, who have promised their co-operation editorially, and will act as a Committee of Reference. The first issue will consist of a series of 12 or 13 Tractates, by various writers, of 48 pages each, in a readable type, crown 8vo, at the price of 6d., and will appear fortnightly for six months, by way of trial.

A Single Copy sent post free for 7d. . . .
The Series of 12 Nos. sent post free for 7s., or for 7s. 6d. if 13 . . . . . } *if prepaid.*
Additional Copies sent at proportionate rates .

PROPOSED SUBJECTS AND AUTHORS.
(AMONGST OTHERS.)

***Sacramental Confession.*** A. H. WARD, M.A.

***Abolition of the Articles.*** NICHOLAS POCOCK, M.A.

***The Sanctity of Marriage.*** JOHN WALTER LEA, B.A.

***Creation and Modern Science.*** GEORGE GREENWOOD, M.A.

***Retreats for Persons Living in the World.*** T. T. CARTER, M.A.

***Missions.*** J. EDWARD VAUX, M.A.

***Catholic and Protestant.*** EDWARD L. BLENKINSOPP, M.A.

***Some Principles of Ceremonial.*** J. E. FIELD, M.A.

***Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament.*** HENRY HUMBLE, M.A.

***Catholicism and Progress.*** EDMUND G. WOOD, M.A.

***A Layman's View of Confession.*** J. DAVID CHAMBERS, M.A.

# MODERN PARISH CHURCHES.

# MODERN

# PARISH CHURCHES

*THEIR PLAN, DESIGN, AND FURNITURE*

BY

J. T. MICKLETHWAITE, F.S.A.

ARCHITECT

" Something there is more needful than expense
And something previous ev'n to Taste—'tis Sense.
POPE

LONDON: HENRY S. KING & CO.

65 CORNHILL AND 12 PATERNOSTER ROW

1874

Rec'd April 17. 1877.

[*All rights reserved.*]

# CONTENTS.


| SECTION | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTORY | 1 |
| II. | OF THE GENERAL PLAN | 7 |
| III. | OF THE PEWS | 28 |
| IV. | OF THE FONT | 37 |
| V. | OF THE PULPIT | 41 |
| VI. | OF THE LITANY DESK | 45 |
| VII. | OF SCREENS | 46 |
| VIII. | OF THE ROOD-LOFT | 51 |
| IX. | OF THE CHOIR SEATS AND DESKS | 56 |
| X. | OF THE ORGAN | 64 |
| XI. | OF LECTERNS | 81 |
| XII. | OF THE CHANCEL LEVELS AND STEPS | 86 |
| XIII. | OF THE ALTAR-RAIL | 90 |
| XIV. | OF THE ALTAR | 92 |
| XV. | OF THE REREDOS | 98 |
| XVI. | OF ALTAR-CANOPIES | 125 |

| SECTION | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| XVII. | OF THE CREDENCE AND PISCINA | 132 |
| XVIII. | OF THE SEDILIA | 145 |
| XIX. | OF MINOR ALTARS AND SIDE CHAPELS | 150 |
| XX. | OF CONFESSIONALS | 154 |
| XXI. | OF THE SACRISTY AND VESTRY | 160 |
| XXII. | OF THE BELFRY AND BELLS | 168 |
| XXIII. | OF CLOCKS, SAND-GLASSES, AND SUN-DIALS | 172 |
| XXIV. | OF ARTIFICIAL LIGHTING | 184 |
| XXV. | OF WARMING AND VENTILATION | 200 |
| XXVI. | OF ALMS-BOXES | 217 |
| XXVII. | OF NOTICE BOARDS | 220 |
| XXVIII. | OF MONUMENTS AND INSCRIPTIONS | 223 |
| XXIX. | OF ARCHITECTURE, AND OF THE FUNCTION OF THE ARCHITECT | 236 |
| XXX. | OF STYLE | 250 |
| XXXI. | OF ORNAMENT AND ORNAMENTS | 271 |
| XXXII. | OF PICTURES AND IMAGES | 307 |
| XXXIII. | OF THE SIZE AND COST OF CHURCHES | 330 |

# PREFACE.

THIS little book makes no pretension either to exhaustiveness or profundity. It is no more than an A B C book on a subject which has so far been without one. The idea of writing some such book occurred to me five or six years ago, and I had written so much as now forms the second section, when for some reason which I have forgotten, the work was laid aside until the autumn of 1870, when, being asked by the editor of the *Sacristy* to contribute to that magazine, I sent him what I had written, making it the commencement of a series of papers which was continued for something more than two years, at intervals, as it was wanted, or as I had leisure. In papers so written, it is almost impossible but that sometimes subjects are introduced in one section, which in strict propriety ought to belong to

another. In revision I have endeavoured to rectify this defect, but I am conscious that it still exists to some extent.

In the original series in the *Sacristy*, the section on Bells was written by the Rev. J. T. Fowler, M.A., F.S.A., whose special knowledge of the subject enabled him to treat of it very much more fully than I could have done. Mr Fowler inserted in his paper one or two trifling suggestions of mine which I have now taken the liberty of re-appropriating, whilst I have profited largely by his, and, even where I express opinions opposed to his, I am more than once indebted to him for having directed my attention to the matter.

Instead of my own meagre chapter on the Organ, I now insert one kindly written for me by my friend Mr Somers Clarke, jun., who, besides having a practical knowledge of the instrument, can speak of it from experience, not as an architect only, but as an organist and choirman.

In revising the whole, I have freely corrected and added to the original series, and in doing so, have taken advantage of suggestions from several friends, and, in one or two instances, from reviewers in the public journals. The last three sections, making, with those on the Organ and on Bells, more than a fourth of the whole, are now printed for the first time.

I ought to say that the sections on *Architecture* and *Style* were written, and already in print, for the *Sacristy*,

before the appearance of Mr T. G. Jackson's "Modern Gothic Architecture," and the whole of my book was written and revised before I had seen his. Had it not been so, I should probably have said much less than I have done upon those matters of which he has also treated. But it is of little moment; one book may be read where the other is not, and there can come no harm from the same truths being urged from rather different points of view. We have both said some things which have often been said before, but they will have to be repeated yet a great many times before they produce much visible result.

I have confined myself to the consideration of *parish* churches. Much that I have written applies equally to collegiate and other churches; but I have preferred not to discuss their special requirements, because almost every one has its own.

Some of the points noticed are so simple and apparently self-evident that the deliberate arguing of them seems almost silly; but it is justified by their being so continually neglected in practice.

Perhaps a few readers may observe that in some works carried out under my direction something may be found which is condemned in this book. I admit it, and plead in defence that an architect cannot always have his own way. There is a sort of idea of orthodoxy attached to certain ways of doing things which makes the clergy particularly tenacious of them; and

I ought rather to be grateful for having so often been allowed to depart from them, than surprised that in one or two cases I have been obliged to submit to them.

J. T. M.

3 DELAHAY STREET, GREAT GEORGE STREET, S.W.,
*January* 1, 1874.

# MODERN PARISH CHURCHES.

## *SECTION I.*

### INTRODUCTORY.

"HOUSES are built to live in, not to look on," says Lord Bacon, and in like manner it may be said, "Churches are built for use, not for ornament." Neither in houses nor churches ought appearance to be neglected, but the designer of each of them ought to be guided by a consideration of the purposes to which they are to be applied. This seeming truism is generally accepted so far as houses are concerned; but in the case of churches it now receives very little attention. This is a church-building age. During the last fifty years there have been more new churches erected than in any period of equal length since the thirteenth century; but out of so many there are very few with which great fault may not be found.

Some improvement has certainly been made on the old preaching-house type of the Georgian period; galleries have been abolished, chancels of a sort have been

added, and a certain standard of what is called *correctness* has been reached. Indeed, some churches have been erected which leave very little to be desired; but they are so exceptional that their success seems the result of accident rather than of forethought. And, so far as I am aware, no attempt has been made to examine the requirements of a modern parish church with a view to providing a plan which will best meet them.

Most church architects seem entirely to ignore utility, and to be guided by a knowledge, more or less imperfect, of our Middle-Age churches, modified in some cases by a few modernisms picked up during holiday rambles on the Continent. These, and a certain vague nothing, called *symbolism*, are all which make up the just-mentioned "correctness." No modernism appears to be consciously admitted, unless it is imported. If the conditions of the services and congregation were now exactly like those which produced the old churches, no harm could come from our copying them. But though our services are mainly the same, the mode of celebrating them is much modified, and the condition of the congregations is totally changed. There is much in the old churches which we do not want, and they lack other things which we require. Consequently, this modern revival of the dead letter of mediævalism is productive, not only of inconvenience, but often of absurdity. We may see in one church the chancel seats hung on hinges and provided with misericords.[1] These are now of course

[1] Small bracket-shaped seats, upon which, by indulgence (*misericordia*, whence the name), it was allowed to rest at certain times, when the rubric

never wanted, which is fortunate; for, in the case alluded to, they are so cunningly contrived as to present their *edges* to any one attempting to sit upon them. At another place may be seen a tall niche in the wall, holding a processional cross near the principal entrance to the church. This is even more absurd than the other because there is a greater affectation of knowingness about it. Of old, when a priest visited a parishioner for the purpose of administering any of the sacraments, he started from the church; and the cross was carried before him by the clerk. It was consequently convenient that the cross should be kept near the door from which they set out, and in a few old churches a long niche is to be found there provided for that purpose. Our modern architect seeing this niche, and having discovered its use, at once reproduces it as a new and undoubtedly "correct" arrangement; never reflecting that now the cross is used only in the chancel, or in processions which

required standing. I never met with an English name for them. The "correct" name, *miserere*, is neither English nor Latin, and altogether unmeaning. Having touched on nomenclature, it may be as well to remark that most of the fine words which "correct" people so love are wrongly applied, and nearly all of them are unnecessary. Why talk about a *hagioscope?* The old English word *squint* will do just as well. Why are clerks in many churches dubbed *acolytes*, when there is not one ordained acolyte amongst them? This affectation is mischievous because of the prejudice which it excites. The present disturbance about St Barnabas, Pimlico, is a very good case in point. If the authorities of the church had simply announced that they were going to put a canopy over the altar, it is very unlikely that any one would have made the least objection. But when the British Philistine stumbles against the awful word *Baldacchino*, the very great length of it, as he spells it through, frightens him out of his five wits, and conjures up before him the horrid spectre which his grandfathers used to associate with brass money and wooden shoes.

start from the chancel, and consequently will have to be fetched from the west end of the church every time it is wanted.

Instances might be multiplied, but these two are sufficient to show that the reproduction of old work, even if accurate, is not necessarily suited to modern wants. I do not wish to deprecate the study of our old churches. On the contrary, I would have them more diligently studied than they are—for they are our best guides—but intelligently. It is the spirit, not the form, which we should seek to imitate. The old churches were arranged to suit the old conditions, and as the conditions varied the builders did not hesitate to make the buildings vary also; and to such an extent that even in their present state it is often possible to ascertain what were the special conditions under which churches were built, and thereby to distinguish a parochial from a collegiate, and a secular from a regular church, and even to point out to what particular order the church may have belonged. It is just this same kind of difference which there ought to be between a modern church and the old. The requirements of a modern church are not more different from those of the old than they were from one another. And if we honestly plan our building accordingly, we shall find it to have far more affinity with the old than have those wretched productions of modern mediævalism, where we see comparatively small churches with nave, aisles, tower, transepts, and an eastern arm too long for a sanctuary and too short for a chancel; and inside, fittings which do not fit, pews facing

all ways, north, south, east, and even west, like pens in a cattle market, choir seats here under the tower, here east of it, there floating about between the two, and right nowhere; whilst the organ is thrust out of sight anywhere, perhaps, in some remote cockloft over a vestry, or even a porch, because the architect never saw an "old example," and does not know what to do with it.

As one step towards the return to rational church designing, I have ventured to put forth in the following pages a few considerations with respect to some of the more general and obvious matters. But I wish it to be understood that I have no intention to dogmatise, to say, "This thing is right and nothing else." To do so would be but to set up a sort of "correctness" of my own. I always give my reasons, and my conclusions must be judged by them. My object is not to force my opinions on other men, but to induce them to think for themselves; and if any one can suggest an improvement on any point, I shall myself be the first to accept it. It may be said that some of the points examined are insignificant matters, about which it is useless to trouble ourselves. But surely, if public worship is granted to be anything better than a solemn sham, nothing connected with it can be called unimportant or unworthy of our most careful consideration. And, even if we are indifferent to these things ourselves, we build for posterity, and we have no right to entail upon them the results of our carelessness.

As for *symbolism*, which some people would have us believe was the ruling influence in the old plans, I do

not think it had anything in the world to do with them. Ceremonial was sometimes symbolical, as also were some of the decorations of the churches, but the churches themselves were arranged to suit the practical requirements of those who were to use them. Fanciful people, it is true, sometimes gave mystical interpretations to the arrangements *after* they were made, and indeed Durandus himself, the prophet of symbolism, often gives alternative interpretations for different arrangements of the same thing, as, for instance ("Rationale," lib. iv. cap. x. n. 2), where, having explained the three chains of a censer as setting forth the three unions in the person of Christ, he suddenly says, "*Quidam enim quartam unionem assignant . . . . unde et quædam turibula quatuor catenulas habent.*" If any one chooses to think that the maker of a censer sat down to consider which of these theological theories seemed to have the most authority, and having made up his mind arranged for three or four chains accordingly, he is at liberty to do so; but if he does, I hope he will acknowledge, as lib. i. cap. i. n. 24–26 bids him, that the windows were not put in the church to let in light but to symbolise the Holy Scriptures, nor the pillars to hold up the roof, but to represent the bishops and doctors of the church.

## *SECTION II.*

### OF THE GENERAL PLAN.

THE difference between the requirements of a mediæval and of a modern church affect this more than the details of arrangement. In the Middle Ages, as a rule, there were several altars, even in the smallest parish churches, but now there is generally but one, and under ordinary circumstances more than two are never wanted. This change renders unnecessary the long transepts and the numerous side chapels which were introduced for the reception of minor altars. Another modification is introduced by the great size of our modern organs. Formerly organs were rare, and small; now every church has, or hopes to have, its organ, and the instrument has become so large as to require a special provision in the plan for its accommodation. Moreover, in old churches the space was in excess of the requirements, whereas now, on the contrary, the requirements are almost always greatly in excess of the space at command. This necessitates a compactness in modern plans, which in the old ones was unnecessary.

But leaving antiquity out of the question, let us

consider how we may dispose the plan, so that it may best suit the uses to which the building is to be put. We have to provide, first, for the convenient performance of the services, whether at the altar or in the choir; and secondly, for the accommodation of the congregation assisting at the services. Our church then will contain three main divisions, the place of the people, the place of the choir, and the place of sacrifice, or, as we usually say, the nave, or body of the church; the choir, and the sanctuary or presbytery,[1] each of which parts requires to be considered by itself and in its relations to the other two.

It is, and has been, the custom in England to place the choir between the sanctuary and the nave. In some churches, in various parts of the Continent, the choir is behind the altar, whilst in Spain we find the congregation placed between them. Of these three arrangements the first must now be adopted, even granting that the other two are equally advantageous. For tradition ought always to be respected, unless it can be shown that the proposed innovation is also an improvement. But in the case we are now considering, the usual plan is the best; for by it the choir are made to take the place of the leaders of the congregation. Reverence requires that the sanctuary should be fenced off from the public part of the church; and it is a usual and

[1] This seems to have been the name most often used in England during the Middle Ages, and it is still traditionally retained in many of our cathedrals; though curiously it has often come to be used for the space *behind* the altar.

convenient arrangement with us that the choir should be included within the screens (*cancellæ*) forming the enclosure, which from them takes the name of chancel. This division of the church into nave and chancel may either be marked structurally, which is now most common, and was general in England during the Middle Ages; or it may be made solely by the disposition of the fittings, without reference to the design of the building. This latter system is very costly, and though it gives facilities for one kind of architectural display, has not, so far as I know, any special advantages sufficient to justify the abandonment of the other, and with us the traditional way of building. But supposing it to be adopted, the provision of the chancel becomes a very simple matter; for, given a large undivided area of any regular form—whether founded on the circle, the parallelogram, or a combination of the two—we have but to raise a dais at the eastern part for the altar and enclose sufficient space in front of it for the choir, and the arrangement is complete, except as regards details, which do not belong to this section. We have in fact to place upon the floor of a large hall the ground plan of a church of the other type, in discussing which, therefore, we are really discussing both.

In planning the portion of the church set apart for the people, the problem which is presented to us is—how, first, may we best provide for a congregation worshipping towards one altar? and how, secondly, may they be so placed that all may hear the words of the preacher? The first point depends more on the ar-

rangement of the fittings than on the plan of the building; for with a well-appointed church and services, it is not necessary that every one present should be able to see the whole of the chancel. The altar should indeed be the markedly principal object in the building, and the æsthetic interest should, so to speak, gravitate towards it. But this effect is brought about, not so much by striving to make the altar visible from every corner, as by giving it a dignified appearance when it is seen. If the whole feeling of a building leads up to one point, it matters little whether that point be always visible or not. Unless this be allowed, it must follow that for years we have been planning our churches on an entirely wrong system. We must give up the placing of the whole congregation on the ground floor, and even the old Georgian fashion of an oblong room with galleries round three sides will but imperfectly serve our turn. If it be insisted upon that every member of the congregation should be able to see the altar from his place, architects must look for instruction, not to mediæval churches, but to modern theatres, where they will find a similar requirement successfully met.

Although Churchmen do not hold that sermon-hearing is the sole or the chief object of church-going, there is no property more essential to a perfect church than that it should make a good lecture-room. The familiar words of the daily services may be followed with ease, although only imperfectly heard. But in a sermon it is necessary that every syllable should reach the ears of the auditors. Moreover, the preacher is unable to make

use of musical recitation as a help to his voice. One chief aim, therefore, in planning the people's part of the church must be to bring the whole well "within range" of the pulpit.

It would seem, at first sight, that the easiest way of doing this is to make a single undivided nave like a rectangular hall. And up to a certain size this plan may be used with success. But several objections present themselves to our applying this principle to large buildings.

The question of construction need not influence us. An architect ought to have no more real difficulty in roofing over a span of sixty feet than one of thirty. If, then, we have a space of the former width at our disposal, is there any reason why we should prefer to roof it in three spans rather than in one? I think so. For supposing that we place the whole under one roof, we obtain for the nave of our church a large hall sixty feet wide, and say one hundred feet long. Now a chancel of corresponding width would, besides being enormously costly, be of such inconvenient proportions as to be practically useless. Our chancel, then, must be considerably narrower than the nave—say thirty feet wide. This chancel will of necessity open into the nave by a comparatively narrow arch, with a considerable wall space, pierced or unpierced, on either side of it. The inevitable result is that the chancel, instead of being, as it should be, the more important and dignified, though the smaller division of the church, becomes a mere insignificant appendage to the nave. To remedy this,

it is necessary to restore uniformity of *scale* throughout the building, which can only be done, without reducing the size, by cutting up our wide nave into parts, the proportions of no one of which shall be in marked contrast to those of the chancel. Our large hall thus becomes a nave of moderate size, with aisles. If the dividing arcades be not too massive, the unity of the whole as an auditorium is not interfered with; and experience has shown that the acoustic properties are improved rather than injured by the subdivision.

The comparative width of the nave and aisles must vary much according to the architectural character of the building. The general tendency has lately been to reduce aisles unduly. Some modern architects have treated them as little more than passages; and in a town church of moderate size the effect of this is often good, although it becomes ridiculous when the aisles are so reduced as to be measured by inches. Where large accommodation is wanted, and the funds at command are small, aisles, almost equal to the nave in width, may be used, as we often see them with very good effect in our old churches. It takes very little more wall to build a wide aisle than a narrow one, and the additional room obtained by it is very great. However wide the space allotted to the congregation may be, it ought never to be divided into more than three spans, for many rows of pillars near together, though they may add to the picturesqueness, take away from the dignity of the building, besides cutting up the space more than is convenient. People cut off

from the nave by one arcade are not appreciably severed from the general body, and from the general centralisation, but when cut off by two arcades they are. I am not prepared to say that double aisles ought not under any circumstances to be used, but, if they are, it should only be in very large churches, and the outer ones ought to be additional to the congregational part of the building. So treated, they may add much to the nobility of a building, but the case is not very likely to occur in a modern parish church.

The common and rapidly spreading practice of separating the sexes in church requires that the plan should be symmetrical, consequently naves with only one aisle should be avoided, as also should the arrangement known as a double nave. This latter has the further objection of reducing the dignity of the chancel; old churches on this plan had *two chancels*.

I have said that the division into nave and aisles does not interfere with the unity of the congregation, the preacher is able to command his whole audience at once. If, however, a central tower with transepts be added, the case is widely different. Each transept requires a system of seating of its own: and practically, instead of one, the preacher has to address three congregations. And the relative situations of these three is such that he cannot be placed advantageously to all of them at the same time. For if the pulpit be in the crossing, the western piers of the tower, necessarily of considerable size, will cut off the aisles and probably part of the nave itself. Whereas if the pulpit be in the nave, the tran-

septs are not only behind the preacher, but are also separated from him by the same piers. The difficulty of conveniently seating the space under the tower is such that it is generally left empty.

A further objection to a central tower, with transepts west of the screen, is, that it removes the bulk of the congregation, who must always be in the nave and aisles, to a distance from the chancel. Now, as I have before said, it is not necessary that every worshipper should see the altar. But it should never be forgotten that the altar is the centre of all public worship, and the chancel containing the altar is only the more dignified part of the building of which the people occupy the other part. Each division requires to be complete in itself, but the two must have the closest connection with one another.

It is impossible to lay down any general rule as to the relative sizes of the nave and the chancel, but usually it is best that the chancel should be little, if at all, narrower than the nave, and a little more than half its length. Most modern chancels are too short; the sanctuary, or eastern part, being reduced to a few feet, instead of being, as its uses require, about equal in length to the space allotted to the choir.

Besides being the general tradition in English parish churches, the square east end will be found most suitable to the internal arrangements of the sanctuary, and should, therefore, be ordinarily adopted in preference to the apse. But sometimes on confined sites, by using an apse, we may be able to make more of the ground than

we could without it. A polygonal apse is better than a round one, as the altar stands better in it,—that is, supposing the altar to stand against or near the east wall, as it usually does in churches of moderate size. In a large church, however (but unfortunately we never now build any such), the altar ought to stand forward in front of the apse, against a high reredos, going all across the sanctuary, as may be seen at Westminster, except that there the reredos is scarcely of sufficient height. A round apse has the disadvantage of necessitating that the windows should be very narrow, for an arch of any considerable size becomes painfully distorted on a curved plan.

Besides the requirements of the chancel within itself, which will be further discussed when treating of the arrangements in detail, it is necessary to provide an easy passage for communicants to and from the altar. For this purpose, there should be, in all but the very smallest churches, besides the principal entrance at the west, doors from the chancel on the north and south sides, or at least on one of them, so that communicants may approach from the west, and pass off to the right and left, thus avoiding the confusion of two streams of people meeting in a confined space. It must, therefore, be considered a rule, that no chancel should be without an aisle or chapel of some sort opening into it on one, if not on both sides. These side appendages may be treated architecturally, either as aisles or transepts, and one of them will generally be found to be the best place for the organ. The other may contain seats for the children, if

it be desirable to provide for them apart from the rest of the congregation. The central tower, which we rejected as an appendage to the nave, is open to no objection when placed over the chancel. No place can be better for a choir than the space below it; a short transept forms an excellent organ chamber, and the eastern tower arch makes a noble entrance to the sanctuary. Indeed, both for internal and external effect, I know of no disposition of the eastern part of a church superior to this.

Now, passing on from the church proper (*i.e.*, the parts actually used for public worship), let us consider the secondary portions of the building. Of these the tower, although not the most essential, claims our first attention, on account of its size and architectural importance.

It will have been gathered from what has been already said, that the inside of the church should be first considered, and that the internal requirements of the building should regulate its external form. This seemingly common-sense principle is the exact opposite of that which appears to guide the majority of modern architects, who, influenced doubtless by the feeling that the public will see more of the outside than of the inside of their buildings, sacrifice everything to external effect; and whilst they crowd the exterior with useless gable-ends, carvings, and pinnacles, too often leave the sanctuary as bare as a coal-cellar, and place the pulpit where half the congregation cannot hear the preacher. But although this is to be condemned, it does not follow that the outside of a church should be neglected. On the contrary, inasmuch as its success or failure depends more on general outline

than on elaboration of detail, it must be borne in mind from the very commencement of our planning.

If a church is to have a tower, its whole treatment must necessarily be much effected by the situation in which we place that tower. Now the connection between the tower and the services carried on in the church is so slight, that the two may be considered independently of one another. The tower may be placed anywhere, so long as it does not interfere with the unity of the main building, of which its lower story may or may not be made to form a part; or the tower may even be entirely detached, but if so, accommodation should be provided near the chancel for the Sanctus bell. Being thus left at liberty by our principle of making the services govern the plan, we must, in this instance, seek some other rule.

This rule I think should be to so group the tower and the church, that the two combined may have the most dignified appearance from the greatest number of possible points of view. On an absolutely free site, nothing equals a central tower placed, for reasons before given, over the chancel, not between it and the nave. By this, the church and tower are united in one composition, the tower forming the crowning feature of the church; whereas in other arrangements there is a danger of the church becoming a mere appendage to the tower. But the bulk of a central tower, which is regulated by the width of the chancel, will sometimes prevent its use on account of the cost. The next best situation is the west end, and where the ground will admit of it, one of these two positions should be adopted. For I hold that in designing a

monumental building, such as a church should be, we ought not to abandon a symmetrical form without good and sufficient reason. The mediæval builders, to whom we pretend to look for guidance, did not do so. I do not think they ever deliberately designed a lopsided church. The irregular and distorted plans which we see, are the result of necessity or accident, or of successive additions. They hugely mistake the spirit of "Gothic" art, who think it is to be found in irregularity and "quaintness." These are characteristic rather of the Elizabethan than of the mediæval period. The pointed style is indeed a style of liberty, but not of lawlessness. Laws, though self-imposed, are essential to nobility in art. Without them freedom becomes licentiousness, refinement becomes mere prettiness, and originality descends to eccentricity and vulgarity. The first architectural law is to do the right thing in the right way and in the right place, not because it is "Gothic" or "correct," but because it is right. And, moreover, what was right in the thirteenth century is very often utterly wrong in the nineteenth. Consequently, he who now blindly copies from the buildings of the Middle Ages is as far removed from their spirit as he who decks out a Christian church with plaster tripods and skulls.

When the site is confined on the north and south, and the approach is from the west, an excellent effect may be produced by continuing the aisles along the sides of the tower, or by making a western transept and treating the whole as a façade, as is done in some Lincolnshire churches, and on a much larger scale in Germany. We

thus obtain a free space west of the nave, which, if the chief entrances open into it, will be found to be very convenient, when we consider the arrangement of the pews.

When the ground to be built upon is small and irregularly shaped, and it is necessary to make the most of it, the tower may legitimately be placed in any position which will least interfere with the development of the main plan, at the end or side of an aisle, or at the side of the chancel, and opening in to it and the aisle by arches. In the latter case, the lower part will form an excellent organ chamber. And, indeed, in small churches, the tower may be sometimes placed in this position, as the best way of providing for the organ, even though the shape of the site does not require it.

It sometimes happens in large towns that a site is closely built up to, on all sides except the one from which it is approached. In such a case, I think it would be best to bring the tower boldly up to the street line, and let it tell of the church behind.[1] A parish church ought not to require to be looked for. The main entrance would thus be through the tower, which must, if necessary, be connected with the church by a wide corridor.

When the funds are small, it is much the best to have no tower: it is not absolutely necessary. A church is complete without it; and consequently, if a good one cannot be had, it is better to be without altogether, and leave it to be added afterwards. The money which

[1] This is the case in several of the city churches.

would build a poor tower will be much better spent in thickening the walls or improving the fittings. One modern trick is particularly to be condemned, that is the paltry dodge of putting a lean tower at the end of an aisle, and surmounting it with a leaner spire, just large enough to hold up a lightning conductor, and springing from below the level of the ridge of the nave roof.

If there is no tower, a turret or gable should be provided for a bell, either at the west end or near the chancel. And the same should be done even when there is a tower, if its situation is such that the Sanctus bell cannot conveniently hang in it. The best place is either a gable over the chancel arch, or a turret at the side, the bell-rope being brought down inside the chancel.

Modern vestries are, with few exceptions, ridiculously inadequate. A parish church requires more vestry accommodation now than it did in the Middle Ages, when a small room for a sacristy was usually enough. This is caused partly by the modern custom of the clergy vesting there before entering the chancel, but chiefly by the large choirs of laymen, now common, who also require to vest before taking their places. The requirements of the sacristy are much the same now that they were then. One small, often very small room, is all that is now allowed to serve all these purposes. And even when an additional vestry is provided for the choir, it has often no communication with the other, being sometimes separated from it by even the whole length or breadth of the church.

There ought always to be two vestries, one for the clergy and one for the choir, the former being also used as sacristy, by which name I shall for the future generally speak of it. Except that there should be direct communication between them, without passing into the church, the two vestries are quite independent of one another, and may be considered separately. The sacristy ought to be perfectly private; it must never be necessary to pass through it to get from one part of the church to another, and should not have a door into the open air. It should also be sufficiently large to contain, without crowding, the various presses, cupboards, &c., required for the preservation of the vestments and other objects required in the services. And it should be warmed either by an open fireplace, or by part of the system which warms the church.

During the services it is sometimes necessary to pass in and out from the sanctuary to the sacristy. They should, therefore, be close together, and there should be a door from the sacristy, either directly into the sanctuary, or into one of the chancel aisles, as near as possible to it. In the latter case it would be well to provide a window or "squint" in the wall between them, so that any one standing in the sacristy may be able to see into the sanctuary. This window should be closed by a shutter on the side of the sacristy.

The choir vestry ought to be large enough to contain the choir without crowding, and it should be in direct communication with the sacristy, so that the clergy and choir may act together. There should also be easy access

into the church, generally through a chancel aisle, and, if convenient, there may be an outer door.

The proper position for the sacristy, then, is either north or south of the sanctuary, and about on the level of the chancel floor. The choir vestry may be in any position which will allow of a communication with the sacristy. It may even be placed under or over it; but if so the stair ought to be contrived so that it shall not be necessary to pass through the one to get at the other.

In a well-worked parish church, it must happen that at many of the services the congregations are small in comparision with the size of the building. It would be well that in large churches these services should be performed in a small chapel, instead of in the chancel.

In our cathedrals and larger old churches, side altars are now not unfrequently provided for this purpose. But in new churches they are comparatively rarely to be seen. This may be to some extent due to the really small size of even our largest modern churches, which makes the need less apparent. But I think that in every case where the building is seated to accommodate more than five hundred persons, a side-chapel ought to be provided for the less numerously attended services. This chapel should be complete in itself, and be so placed and arranged that the unity of the rest of the church shall not be interfered with, and that its altar shall in no way diminish the importance of the high altar. All arches opening from it into the church ought, of course, to be screened. The position must vary according to circumstances. Usually the most convenient place will be north or south

of the chancel, and parallel with it. But if there it must not be treated architecturally as an aisle: its roof must be gabled, and generally it ought to be wider and higher than the aisle of the nave. Indeed, whether the chapel be here or elsewhere, its use ought to be obvious even outside the building. When next the chancel, there should be doors both from the chancel and from the aisle of the nave, and the chapel will be used as a passage by communicants returning to their places from the high altar. Occasionally a chapel might be placed east of the chancel, like the lady chapel in many of the larger old churches; or where a western transept is used, a chapel might be connected with it either eastward, as at Ely, or laterally, as at St. Paul's Cathedral.

Before leaving this part of the subject, a little consideration ought to be given to the doors and windows of the church. All the main entrances, whether western or lateral, ought to be open into a clear space free from pews at the west end of the church. This space may either be the last bay of the nave, or a western transept, and will be found convenient in many ways. The usual mediæval position for a side entrance, some distance from the west end, should now be avoided, because the alley connected with such entrance separates the congregation into an eastern and a western division, the objections to which I shall consider in the next section.[1]

[1] The mediæval position for the entrance may be kept if the mediæval arrangement of the pews is also adhered to. Old pews are rarely, if ever, found west of the doors, however far east they may be: thus a nave of seven bays has sometimes three of them empty. But modern ideas as to the

Anciently, a porch was added to one or more of the principal doors of a church, to form a protection during parts of the offices of baptism and matrimony, which were performed *ante ostium ecclesiæ*. As the whole of these services is now performed inside the church, this use of the porch is obsolete. It may, however, be retained as a protection of the entrance from the wind. If this be allowed, and all doors are used in the same way both for ingress and egress, each door ought logically to have a porch before it. Modern architects, as a rule, only provide side entrances with porches; and although I believe this to be a mere following of mediæval precedent, it may be justified in the following manner:—

A congregation does not enter a church in a crowd, but assembles by degrees; its dispersion, on the contrary, is general and simultaneous. Consequently, although ample means of egress are necessary, a single door will serve the purpose of entrance. Now, in an artificially warmed and ventilated building, every unnecessary admission of cold air from without is to be avoided. I think, therefore, that all the principal doors of a church except one should be kept closed and curtained over until required at the breaking-up of a congregation. The door used for entrance should be protected by a porch on the outside; and if it be large, it should be provided with a wicket, so that it may not always be necessary to open the whole. By this means

accommodation, as compared with the size of a building, make this now out of the question.

the comfort of the church will be much increased. If this suggestion is acted upon, the door used for entrance, and provided with a porch, ought of course to be on the side on which approach to the church is easiest.

Sometimes in a town church, on a crowded site, there may be doors opening into different streets, entrances from each of which may be required; but even in such a case I would leave only one door open, except when a congregation is assembling for service. Indeed, I have known cases where this has been done of necessity to prevent the church being used as a thoroughfare.

Besides the public entrance to a church, it is sometimes convenient to have side doors for special purposes. For instance, when school children are seated apart from the rest of the congregation, there ought, if possible, to be a door near them, by which they may be quietly brought in and out without disturbing the rest of the worshippers. A door is also useful opening either into the choir vestry or near it. Sometimes one door may be made to serve both these purposes. When the clergy-house is close to the church, there should be a communication between them. This may be through the choir vestry, but should never be through the sacristy. All these doors should be small and unobtrusive.

It may be thought that as long as sufficient light is admitted, the disposition of the windows is a matter of but slight importance. This is a mistake. The whole effect of an interior may easily be spoiled by a badly-

placed window. The light in the nave and aisles ought to be evenly diffused and in sufficient quantity; subdued, indeed, but not so reduced from a sentimental love of the "dim religious," as to require artificial aid at midday, if the sun does not happen to be bright. The higher the windows are from the ground the better, both for architectural effect and exclusion of draughts. In town churches the lighting should be mainly from the clerestory, for by the reduction, or, if possible, the omission of the aisle windows, the noise from passing traffic is best excluded.

Nothing is more common than to see the whole interior of a church ruined by an east window which permits nothing in the chancel to be seen but itself. Some architects, to avoid this defect, prefer to omit it altogether. But I think this is a mistake, for the fault lies not so much in the presence of the east window as in the absence of side light in the chancel. If this be well managed, no harm will result from the size of the east window. At the same time, the development of the altar and its ornaments require that the cill should be well raised, so that ordinarily the east window will not be very large. Sometimes local circumstances *necessitate* its omission, but whether it exists or not, it is of the greatest importance that the sanctuary should be well lighted from the sides. Indeed, it is almost impossible to have too much light here.

Collecting our results, we find that there ought to be a nave and chancel of about the same width, and communicating directly through the chancel arch. The

nave may have aisles, whose width will vary according to circumstances, and transepts for congregational use should never be allowed. All the principal entrances must be in the western part, and one at least should have a porch. The chancel must be accessible from the north or south, or both, as well as from the west, and must have on one side a convenient place for the organ. There should be a sacristy and a choir vestry, which should communicate with one another, and the former also with the sanctuary. The tower, which should not be added unless funds allow of a good one, will ordinarily be either western or central; if the latter, over the chancel, not west of it, but for special reasons it may be allowed to stand almost anywhere.

## *SECTION III.*

### OF THE PEWS.[1]

ON arranging the furniture of the body of the church, the same object must be kept in view as in choosing its plan—namely, the convenience of the congregation as worshippers and as an audience. A church ought not to be crowded with pews. On festivals and special occasions the concourse of people is often great, but at ordinary times it is not so. The building should be large enough to receive the greater number; but if it be filled with pews for this purpose, the usual congregation will appear thin and scattered in them. Besides which, it is reasonable that the smaller number should be concentrated in the best part of the church, which can easily be brought about by confining the permanent seats to that part.

[1] I am quite aware that this word is dreadfully "incorrect." Nevertheless, I mean to stick to it. It has been the name for the fixed seats provided for the congregation ever since they had a name in English. And although in late times they have been fashioned after the manner of tanks, I cannot see that they require renaming on the older form being reverted to, any more than the pulpit does on being reduced again to a single deck. The word itself in no way implies the presence of doors, locks, and nameplates, and there is no convenient substitute. The "correct" word is *stalls*, but unfortunately nave seats never are stalls.

In a few modern churches pews have been altogether omitted; and where, in poor districts, this has been done for the sake of economy, nothing can be said against it; but in expensive buildings, where their cost has evidently not caused their exclusion, it seems to be without sufficient reason. For a church is meant for the use of the congregation, and the congregation when using the church require to sit and to kneel. Consequently, they must be provided with something to sit upon and something to kneel against. This can certainly be done with chairs, but when a certain part of the building is always required by a sitting and kneeling congregation, and never for any other purpose, is it not right that it should be permanently fitted up for them? It is inconsistent with the dignity of a public building that a continuous requirement should be provided for by a temporary expedient. I think, therefore, that fixed seats should be provided sufficient for the average requirements, and ample floor space should be left, where chairs may be placed when further accommodation is needed. Æsthetically, pews are rather an improvement than not, for they, as architects say, *scale* a building; that is, they give the eye a constant standard for judging of its size. It is a great mistake to think that a building looks better for being empty. Nevertheless, I think it was some idea of this sort which brought up the fashion for pewless churches some twelve or fifteen years ago. But in practice it is never attained; for the chairs which are always there, are quite as great an obstruction as pews.

A further objection against chairs alone is, that they

are liable to be crowded inconveniently together;[1] where there are pews also, these will generally regulate the spacing of the chairs.

In very large churches, where the pulpit is some distance down the nave, it is well that the seats east of it should be chairs, so that they may be turned round to face the preacher. Indeed, I think it is best to have movable seats throughout, so that they may be specially arranged as occasion requires; but we need not inquire further into the matter here, for such a case is not likely to occur in a *modern* parish church for some time to come.

The pews should be arranged in as few blocks as possible, so as to keep the congregation well together. A wide central alley is necessary; but usually no other passages separating the seats should be allowed. We thus have our pews in two equal divisions, approached by an alley in the centre; and, if the width of the building is such as to require them, one on each side against the outer walls. If the church has aisles, there must always be side alleys. Cross alleys from north to south should never be made; for where such exist, it will always be found that there is a tendency amongst the congregation to separate into two classes; and everything interfering in any way with the feeling of perfect

[1] In one well-known London church this is done to such an extent that it is almost impossible to kneel down, or having done so, to rise without overturning the chair behind. The church is made to hold about twice as many as it can properly accommodate, but surely at a great sacrifice. A large congregation is certainly a good thing, but a devout one is better; and how can people properly worship when they are packed so close that they can scarcely move.

equality inside the church should be avoided. This objection exists in a less degree against seating the aisles independently of the nave. And if the aisles be narrow, it is better, as I have just said, not to do this; for if the passage be against the wall, instead of between the nave seats and the aisle seats, the people in the latter are not only made one with those in the former, but are brought nearer to the centre of the building, and consequently nearer to the pulpit, and more in front of the chancel by the whole width of the passage. Where gabled aisles are used, this arrangement would make the pews inconveniently long. The passages must therefore be placed about the middle of the aisles. But I think that beyond the passages, chairs are to be preferred to pews.

It is commonly urged in favour of passages immediately outside the nave arcades, that they expose the bases of the pillars to view. Truly a noble object, and one worthy of an artistic mind, to sacrifice the convenience of the building for the sake of the base of a pillar! But I would ask, is the church made for the base, or the base for the church? And does the sight of a base add in the slightest degree to the general impression which the whole building should convey to the spectator's mind? This argument shows a vice which is almost universal amongst modern church designers, who treat their buildings as mere collections of detail to be examined and criticised separately. This alone is sufficient to account for that cold, hard, unused, unsympathetic look which is complained of in many even of our most elaborately finished and decorated interiors.

The communication from one part of the building to another should be as free as possible; consequently, the pews should not be brought close up to the eastern responds, but a space of at least three feet should be left, thereby allowing a passage from the aisles to the chancel arch and nave. The alleys should be wide, especially that in the centre, which, speaking roughly, should measure one foot for every four in the width of the nave between the walls.[1]

To avoid crushing and confusion at the breaking up of a congregation, there ought to be large, clear spaces in front of the doors; and as these spaces, if in the pewed part of the church, would separate the seats, it is best that all the doors should open into a large area at the west end, into which the alleys of the nave and aisles will empty themselves. This area may be the western bay of the church, treated, if so preferred, rather differently from the rest; or it may be a tower, with the aisles continued along its sides; or it may be a western transept, with or without a tower.

It may possibly be argued, that to bring all the doors near together is rather to create confusion than to prevent it. But this is not really the case; for if doors were provided in various places, few people would go out at those nearest to them. The majority would rather spend ten minutes in struggling across to the door in

[1] Some architects, I believe, consider four feet six inches the *maximum* width for a central passage. I make six feet the *minimum*. So far as I have observed old churches, those with aisles rarely have the central passage less than nine feet, or the side ones less than five feet. In aisleless churches the passages are narrower.

the direction they wished to take, than two in walking round the church outside. If, however, the doors are near together, people are more likely to go out at the first they come to.

Having settled the position of the blocks of seats, the pews themselves next require consideration. Care must be taken in arranging these that room is not lost by the bases of the pillars cutting in irregularly amongst them. To avoid this, the spacing from back to back of the seats, which may vary from thirty-four to thirty-eight inches, must exactly divide the length of a bay. Thus, if the seats are to be thirty-six inches apart, the bays must be twelve, fifteen, or eighteen feet each. And, further, each pillar must have a seat so placed with respect to it as just to allow the back, forming the book-board, &c., of the pew next behind, to pass on the west side of it. The seat-boards ought to be properly stopped with ends against the pillars, not scribed to fit them.

All pews, but particularly short ones, should be planned of a length to accommodate a definite number of persons. A seat five feet long will hold three adults, whereas one of six feet is not enough for four; but it is sufficient to tempt an unthinking churchwarden to crowd people inconveniently together. The extra foot is then worse than useless, and had far better be given to the alley, to which it *can* do no harm, and which it *may* enable to hold an additional row of chairs when required.

It is not my intention to describe in detail the form and dimensions of every part of a pew, which may vary

much in different cases with equally satisfactory results.[1] But I will mention a few points which should be attended to. The pews should be comfortable to sit in, but should not be as lounges some aim at making them. They must be convenient to kneel in, to obtain which the backs should be low, not more than two feet eight inches from the floor to the top; and unless the seats be very widely spaced, the book-board should not be on the top rail. The framing of the backs should be without panels below the seats, so as to avoid dark places, where dirt is unseen, and consequently allowed to accumulate. The floor on which the seats stand must be flush with the pavement, so that the whole congregation, whether on benches or on chairs, may be on the same level. Lastly, if there be kneeling-boards, they should be horizontal, and very slightly raised from the floor. Some modern boards seem made for the express purpose of preventing people from kneeling. I think small stools are better than continuous boards. Hassocks gather dirt, and should not be used.

I myself think it is better not to have special seats for children, but to provide special services suited to their understanding, during which they will have the pews to themselves, and at other times to let them sit amongst the adults. If, however, it is necessary to provide for them separately, they should be so placed, that whilst fairly able to join in the service, they may be as much as

[1] Of late years many architects have shown a great liking for fantastically-shaped pew-ends. Now that which is fantastical can scarcely be dignified, and therefore ought not to be admitted into church design.

possible cut off from the view of the rest of the congregation. A chancel aisle will generally be the best place for them; the south rather than the north, which, as we shall see further on, is usually the place for the organ; and the south aisle is best commanded by the pulpit, standing, as it ordinarily does, by the north-east respond of the nave. A small door should be provided, through which the children may be quietly brought in and out, without clattering along the whole length of the church.

Galleries are now so generally rejected, that it may be thought superfluous to allude to them; but before leaving this section of the subject, I think we ought to consider whether galleries, which very much increase the nominal accommodation, may not under certain circumstances be used with advantage. The argument from their unsightliness is of no value; it might be used against their introduction into an existing building, but there is no more real difficulty in designing a new church with galleries than one without them. They are of two sorts—side galleries, and end or west galleries. Their floors must be made to rise, otherwise all people, except those in the front, would be entirely cut off from the church. It follows that in the side galleries the pews must face north and south. Now it will be easily seen that people so placed in the aisles of the nave cannot fairly take part in the worship which is going on in the chancel. Nor are they better off as an audience, unless the pulpit be either raised to their level, in which case it would be cut off from the floor space below them, or be placed in the centre, which would interfere with the

principal uses of the church. Side galleries are then practically useless. Æsthetically they altogether contradict the altarward tendency of the church.

A west gallery is not open to these objections,[1] for people in it can conveniently both join in the worship and hear the preacher. It may therefore, under certain circumstances, be allowed. But I think only for some special purpose—say for the accommodation of the inmates of an hospital, of a sisterhood, or even sometimes of schools. If it be used by the congregation indiscriminately, it would soon become either "aristocratic," or the "pauper" part of the church, and so bring about one of those divisions which I have just now been objecting to. On the whole, I think that western galleries should be but exceptionally used in parish churches. In convents, colleges, and private chapels, they may often be convenient for the accommodation of visitors or servants.

[1] Many fifteenth-century churches had western galleries in their towers but whether they had any use besides that of ringing-floors is doubtful.

## *SECTION IV.*

### OF THE FONT.

NEXT after the altar, the most important object in the church is the font. Pews, screens, organ, pulpit, and all other furniture may be done without, but an altar and a font are essential, and their treatment should be such as to render this pre-eminence manifest. In the old services part of the office of baptism was performed outside the church; it was therefore convenient that the font at which the service was concluded should be near the door. Now, however, the whole service takes place at the font, and in presence of the congregation, so that it is not necessary to place it near the door, but where it can be pretty well seen from most parts of the church. To place it to the east in front of the congregation is objectionable, for whilst almost every other object and arrangement in the church is simply subsidiary to the altar, the æsthetic interest of the font centres in itself; consequently, to place it and the altar near together, would produce an antagonism which would detract from the dignity of both. To avoid this, let the font be placed at the west end of the nave, where it may be developed to any desired extent, without danger

of interfering with the altar. The exact position must depend on the plan of the church. If there is a west door, the font should be on one side, and sufficiently advanced from the wall to allow a passage behind it. If there is no west door, it may be in the middle, and against the wall. This is certainly the best position which can be chosen; for thus, the altar and the font occupying the central positions, one at the east and the other at the west, stand out distinctly as the principal objects in the church, and tell to all beholders of the two great sacraments "generally necessary to salvation." No inconvenience can arise from the font being behind the pews, for the congregation never require to kneel or to sit facing it.

Fonts should be large and of good material; but on these points the modern practice is as a rule good. They should be raised above the floor level by one or two steps at the least. And in churches likely to be crowded, I think it would be well for them to stand on slightly elevated platforms sufficiently large to accommodate the sponsors, and all others directly taking part in the ceremony. Such a platform, sufficiently protected by a low parapet or railing, would prevent the font from being used as a hat-stand, as it often now is, and at the same time add to its architectural importance.

In arranging the steps of the font, care should be taken so to widen the top one at the west side, as to prevent all danger of the priest's falling. I have recently seen a custom introduced, where many were being baptized at one time, for the baptism to be performed simultaneously

by two priests at the same font, the water having been hallowed by one of them. Whether this should be allowed or not, I leave it for Ritualists to decide. But if it is to become general, it must be provided for by a corresponding arrangement of the font steps. This will be best done by making the top step broad all round, instead of at the west side only.

The font requires a cover to keep out the dust. This may be either flat or raised, and of more or less richness, according to circumstances. If the former, it should be loose, and not hinged on to the stonework, as is sometimes done, for this is certain to end in the stone being broken where the hinge is let into it. High font covers are best suspended with counterpois weights, so that they may be easily raised and lowered. They may also be fixed to cranes in such a way that they may swing off sideways, but this neither looks so well nor under ordinary circumstances is so convenient as the other; and the same may be said of another arrangement sometimes found in old churches, where the font cover opens like a cupboard. It should never be necessary to *lift* off a high cover. Fonts of porous material ought of course to be lined with lead, and all fonts be provided with a lead waste pipe, plug, and chain. The waste pipe ought not to be connected with the common drain, but with a dry well provided for the purpose, where the water may sink into the ground. The lock always ordered in the Middle Ages is now no longer required; for the water is never[1] left standing in

[1] Or rather, perhaps I should say *ought* never to be, for such things are not

the font, and even if it were, there is now no danger of its being stolen for magical purposes, as was feared then.

The common practice now is to place the priest's book on the edge of the font, where it is in constant danger of being knocked either on to the floor or into the font itself. I think it should have a desk provided for it. The priest takes the child on his left arm, and it is therefore easiest for him to receive it from the left side. Consequently, the right is the place for the book desk, as interfering least with his action. The desk should be on a bent stem, working in sockets at the top and bottom, so that it may be moved about at convenience; and if it be permanently fixed to the font, it must be contrived so as not to interfere with the cover; but perhaps it would be best that the desk with its stem should be removable, and placed in the socket prepared for them on the font only when wanted.

altogether unknown as fonts "utilised" for flower-pots, when churches are being decorated, and we have heard of "a beautiful floral cross," whatever that may be, floating in the font. I wonder if it ever occurred to the good people who do these things to put a *bouquet* into the chalice. It would serve to hold one admirably.

## *SECTION V.*

### OF THE PULPIT.

THIS being a secondary, though an important feature in the church, ought not to be too obtrusive. Its position should of course be that from which the preacher can be best heard, except that for obvious reasons it must not be in the middle of the building. In a church of moderate size, the best place will generally be against one of the eastern responds of the nave; if it be placed actually in the line of the arcade, the least floor space is cut off from the view of the pulpit, for so the pillars on that side only eclipse one another and the space between them. But this is not a matter of much importance.

It is a common custom, and possibly a tradition of the reading of the Gospel in the pulpit, to place it on the north rather than the south side. And ordinarily this should be done; but if, for any positive reason, the south side is better—for instance, if from it the preacher would face a larger number of his audience—the pulpit should certainly be placed there. Where there are chancel aisles, the northern position is practically the

best. To explain which I must anticipate a little, and speak of the organ and choir. Unless it have a clerestory, the choir is entirely lighted from its aisles: but one of these aisles is the best place for the organ, which will usually cut off the greater part of the light from its side. Now much more light comes from the south than from the north; therefore, least is excluded by placing the organ at the north. The organ then occupying the north aisle, the south may sometimes be used for congregational purposes; and it may be commanded by a pulpit placed at the north-east corner of the nave, but would be entirely cut off from one at the south-east by the south pier of the chancel arch.

In very large churches the pulpit may be not quite at the end of the nave, but brought forward a bay, or even more, so that the largest congregation may be addressed. The position may be determined by actual experiment.

The larger the church the greater should be the elevation of the pulpit, but it must never be very high. The preacher requires to be sufficiently raised to obtain a full command of his audience, but should not be lifted out from among them. The diameter will also vary with the size of the church. The floor should be flat, and all those ingenious but very inconvenient contrivances for fitting men of different statures should be avoided. A pulpit about three feet three inches from its floor to the top will suit most men. For the accommodation of those who require it, there should be a small desk, capable

of being raised or lowered. It must face the centre of the congregation, and its mode of adjustment should be simple and obvious to any one entering the pulpit for the first time. I think it ought to be removable, for, to an extempore preacher, it is not only useless, but very much in the way. The top of the pulpit should be broad enough to hold books, &c.

There is a singular but widespread prejudice against the use of a canopy or sounding-board over a pulpit.[1] Such an addition is not necessarily ugly, and is often of very great use, even in a building of moderate size, and no large church should be without one. Care must be taken in designing it to avoid an appearance of insecurity. I can see no object in putting a door to a pulpit, though it was done in the old ones, at least sometimes. Some modern architects have a trick of putting a little bracket, intended for a seat, but much too small to sit upon with ease, in the corner of the pulpit. It is exceedingly seldom that a seat is required there, and when it is, a chair or a stool, which can be used with comfort, may be easily provided.

An odd fancy has come up of late for doing without pulpits; but as long as sermons are retained, why not the conveniences for their delivery? If you cannot afford a pulpit, do the best you can without it. But it is absurd to spend money on a reredos, which is not of any practical use, and go without a pulpit, which is. Wood

[1] They are decidedly "incorrect," but they were not unknown in the Middle Ages.

painted or unpainted is almost always the best material for a pulpit. Stone and marble are too cold, and do not *furnish* a church well. And, under ordinary circumstances, a church cannot afford to have its furniture sacrificed.

## *SECTION VI.*

### OF THE LITANY DESK.

THE small desk for the Litany to be said from, generally miscalled the Faldstool,[1] is now usually placed facing east between the pews, near the east end of the central alley. But when first introduced it seems to have stood in the middle of the chancel. The present position is a very good one, and should be retained; but as it is sometimes desirable to have the alley unobstructed, the litany desk should be movable. In large churches it should be made long enough to accommodate two clergy.

[1] Faldstool—French, *fauteuil;* late Latin, *faldistorium = sella plicatilis* (Du Cange)—really means a *folding stool* or shut-up chair. It is the *sella curulis* of the Roman magistrates, which continued to be the chair of state, both ecclesiastical and secular, all through the Middle Ages (compare *Siége pliant* in Tartuffe, Act II. Scene III.) The so-called throne of Dagobert is a well-known example. In Winchester Cathedral may still be seen the faldstool, said to have been used by Queen Mary on the occasion of her marriage with Philip of Spain. Considering that both the words which make up faldstool are still current English, the mistake as to its meaning is curious, but it appears to be as old as the seventeenth century.

## *SECTION VII.*

### OF SCREENS.

IT is not necessary for me to show at length that in all places and at all times, until the present day, it has been customary to separate, by some sort of barrier, the sanctuary from the part of the church allotted to the congregation. It has been already proved by others beyond all doubt, and will scarcely now be disputed. The primary use of these barriers is of course to protect the altar and its surroundings from profanation. And little though it be to the credit of our boasted toleration and civilisation, the necessity for a good stout fence has not altogether passed away.

On practical grounds these screens should be retained. They are aesthetically valuable on account of the quality of what is called *mystery* which they introduce. The artistic use of this perfectly legitimate element in architectural composition seems to be understood by comparatively few of our modern church architects; although, from the accident of their commonly following mediæval plans, it is rarely altogether absent from their buildings. *Mystery* is more easily understood than

defined. It is the not showing of everything at once, the leaving of something to the imagination of the spectator. It was the absence of it which Pope condemned when he said of Timon's garden [1]—

> "On ev'ry side you look behold the wall!
> No pleasing intricacies intervene,
> No artful wildness to perplex the scene."

In a church, mystery may be obtained both by the disposition of parts and the arrangement of the furniture; and by its judicious use, not only the apparent size, but the dignity and solemnity of the building may be greatly increased. Our ancient minsters owe their religious aspect far more to this than to the dim religious light which is as often as not imaginary. The effect obtained by concealed skylights, and such like theatrical tricks, is of a different order, and is to be altogether condemned. Real art is not to tell lies, but to reserve the truth till the proper moment for speaking it.

Practically, a stone or marble wall is a sufficient screen, if it be high enough on the outside, which, if properly managed, it easily may be without unduly cutting off the chancel from the nave. But, for architectural effect, high screens, as used in the Middle Ages, are much to be preferred. It is a great mistake to suppose that a high rood-screen necessarily cuts a church in two, and detracts from the importance of the altar. Some certainly do so, but the fault is with the design of the screens, not with their height—very often it is that the screen is not high enough. Well managed, it adds very much to the

[1] Epistle to the Earl of Burlington, "Of the use of Riches," ll. 114–116.

apparent size of the building, and, moreover, it forms a very valuable link in the gradual concentration of interest upon the altar.

For about four feet from the ground á rood-screen should be unpierced, partly because open work here generally gives the whole a flimsy appearance; but more especially because it forms the back of the returned stalls, of which more will be said in the proper place. Above this the screen should go up with mullions and tracery until stopped by the cornice or loft, as the case may be. It is important that this light part of the screen should be so high, that from the nave the altar and its ornaments for some distance upwards should be visible through it. If this be the case, the size of the crowning member will not bring about any apparent blocking out of the chancel. Indeed, it is possible that the addition of a heavy cornice, or even of a parapeted loft, may actually increase the transparency of a screen.

The rood-screen should be surmounted by a large cross or rood, not the tree of infamy, but the glorified standard of the Church. The cross must be environed with a halo of tracery and carving, and the figure, if there be one, should express majesty, power, and beneficence, not suffering and death.[1] If it be preferred, the crucifix may be idealised, and, instead of a human figure, a medallion, with a lamb, may be placed at the intersection of the cross. Other images may, or may not, be

[1] Nearly all modern crucifixes represent our Lord as dead, and wounded in the side. This, which I cannot but regard as an erroneous custom, seems only to date from the fifteenth century.

added, according to circumstances. It is usual, both here and in other places, for the crucifix to be accompanied by figures of Our Lady and St John. This is, however, not compulsory, nor is it always desirable. Where the low screen (only the height of the stall backs) is used, the rood should be placed on a beam crossing the church near the east end of the nave.[1] The same may sometimes be done, with good effect, even where the screen is high. This beam need not be exactly over the screen. At Newark church, where the fine late fifteenth-century screen and loft still remain, the rood-beam was placed westward of them by the whole width of the transept. In designing a rood-beam of this sort, care should be taken to prevent its appearing top-heavy.

The gates, both of the western and side screens, should be provided with locks, and kept fastened between the services. It will generally be found best for the gates to open inwards.

Under ordinary circumstances no material equals wood for screens. It is at once light and substantial, both in appearance and in reality. It is equally adapted for simple and for elaborate treatment, and, above all, it is most suitable for coloured enrichment. Stone or metal, separately or combined, may, however, sometimes

[1] At Winterton church, near Brigg, in Lincolnshire, there seems to have been a screen about four feet high set in the middle of the chancel arch. In the chancel walls just east of the arch remain the two corbels which carried the beam. All the wood-work has gone. I know of no remaining instance of a similar arrangement which makes me hesitate about its existence here, but I can account for the present appearances upon no other hypothesis.

be used with good effect, particularly for side screens. Wood and metal rarely work well together. All metal-work, whether in screens or in anything else, should be soberly and rationally treated, according to the nature of the material, be it brass or iron, cast or wrought. Nothing disfigures our churches more than the gimcrack rubbish with which they are stuffed under the name of "art" metal-work.

The rood-screen is now generally the last piece of furniture which is put into a church, instead of being, as it should be, one of the first. I think it should take precedence of the pulpit. It certainly should of the lecterns and reredos, and of all painted glass. In small churches it may sometimes be carried up into the roof, and be made part of the construction of the building.

## *SECTION VIII.*

### OF THE ROOD-LOFT.

THIS is a narrow gallery running across the top of the screen at the entrance to the chancel. It anciently served two requirements, neither of which exists to any great extent at the present moment. But one of them is developing with great rapidity, and the other will arise when churches are built a little larger than they are now. Indeed, a few have already been erected of such dimensions that a loft would be a convenience, although it is not a necessity.

The principal and earlier use of the rood-loft was the reading of the Gospel and Epistle from it at high services. For this there were practical, and, in the case of the Gospel, ritual reasons also, all of which still remain in force. These are, firstly, the same as have already been mentioned when speaking of the preaching arrangements—namely, that whilst the constant parts of the service, which the people know by heart, can be followed, even when the words are very imperfectly audible, the variable portions require to be heard distinctly. This of course does not apply to lessons to

the same extent that it does to the sermon, as they are more or less familiar to the audience. But they are intended to be heard, and it is therefore reasonable to read them from a place whence they may be heard. Now the altar is commonly at the part of the building farthest removed from the people, and consequently if it be insisted that words spoken there must be audible to the whole congregation, our church must be limited to a comparatively small size. But, if it be allowed to read the Gospel and Epistle in the body of the church, we can make practical use of a building, the nave of which alone may equal in length the combined nave and chancel with the other arrangement. The rood-loft, besides being in many cases a great improvement to the church in which it is erected, provides a place in every way convenient for this purpose. Where it does not exist and inconvenience is felt from the remoteness of the altar, the Gospel and Epistle may reasonably be read from the pulpit.

A further argument for a special place being set apart for the reading of the Gospel is, that it is thereby marked out pre-eminently as the chief of the lessons. The Gospel at mass has in all ages been looked upon more particularly as the actual Word of God, and has in consequence been surrounded by peculiar ceremony. In England of old the gospeller having received the textus or gospel-book from the altar with the priest's benediction, carried it solemnly to the appointed place, accompanied by the epistoler, and with lights and incense borne before him. The place appointed was, on week

days and in smaller churches, usually a lectern on the north side of the sanctuary; but on Sundays and festivals, in the larger churches, it was the rood-loft.

It is impossible to lay down any definite rule as to when a loft ought to be introduced. This will depend, to some extent, on the character as well as the size of the church. But, roughly speaking, it may be said that churches accommodating as many as a thousand persons should not be without it.

The loft itself should be not less than five feet broad. Access to it should be easy, and generally by two stairs. In a new building, these stairs should be of stone, and be built in the walls. The entrances to them may be either in the nave, the nave aisles, or the chancel aisles; perhaps they will be best facing one another in the north and south responds of the nave arcade. If a loft is added to an existing building, the stairs will have to be of wood, and will be best to start from the chancel aisles.

The restoration to the church's service of instrumental music other than that of the organ is quite recent among us, but it has been made simultaneously in so many different places that there can be no doubt it will shortly become general. It therefore behoves us to consider how to provide for it in our buildings. A few instruments may be admitted into the chancel, and played by choristers; and, if their use is simply to lead the singing, this should be done. But if a band is wanted, special accommodation must be provided. Their presence in the chancel is objectionable, partly

because they and their instruments would inconveniently crowd it, and partly because there is a great deal of distracting movement necessarily connected with a band, which renders it advisable that they should not be placed in a conspicuous position. They must be near to the chancel, for they should be an auxiliary to the choir, not a substitute for it, like the west-end orchestras of the continental churches, and they must be under the control of the choir-leader, whose place is in the midst of the choir. Simply stated then, the problem is to so place the band that they may be as much as possible out of sight of the congregation, but may themselves have a full view of the chancel.

The place now usually allotted to the band is one of the aisles of the chancel, and, if they are to be on the floor of the church, it is the best that can be chosen. But it has several faults. It is more or less visible from the nave—entirely so from one aisle, and it is so far public that communicants pass that way when returning from the altar. And, moreover, the musicians are separated from the chancel by a screen, which is inconvenient. But, besides this, they stand on a level lower than the floor of the upper stalls, the occupants of which (even if the stalls themselves do not) will cut off the view of the choir-leader. To meet this difficulty, it is usual to raise the choir-leader on a platform of several steps, whereby he becomes unduly conspicuous, sometimes even more than the celebrant.

A less objectionable method would be to raise the floor on which the musicians stand. But all the inconveniences

might be avoided by placing the band where they were of old—namely, in the rood-loft. From thence, the parapet being low on the east side, they have an uninterrupted command of the whole chancel, and the view of them from the nave may be almost entirely cut off. Sometimes the height alone of the loft will effect this, but it may be insured by making its floor on two levels, the western half, used for the Gospel and Epistle, being raised somewhat above the other, which may be done without difficulty or inconvenience.

Now, seeing that a rood-loft is, except in small churches, the most convenient place for singing the Gospel and Epistle, and also for the accommodation of a band of musicians, I think that all churches of considerable size, and all where elaborate services are intended, which should be equivalent to saying all town churches, should be provided with it.

## *SECTION IX.*

### OF THE CHOIR SEATS AND DESKS.

IN arranging these, we have to consider the requirements of the choir within itself, in its relation to the altar, and in its relation to the people. The last point is a modern one. With the old services, a choir office belonged to the choir only; but our matins and evensong suppose the presence of a lay congregation, who are from time to time addressed. It is therefore requisite for the reader to be so placed, that he may conveniently turn to the people. This necessity is so self-evident that it is acknowledged by all except a few very "correct" people. But mediæval precedent here failing, modern architects have been led into all kinds of strange eccentricities in their efforts to meet it.

There is not a more amusing chapter in the annals of the revival of church architecture than the history of "reading desks." The Georgian three-decker, the few surviving examples of which are now such objects of scorn, is really much more worthy of our respect than three-fourths of the "correct arrangements" of the present day. It was the logical result of the doctrine and practice of the time, when the idea of public worship

was entirely lost, when the altar, so far as the multitude were concerned, had been done away with, and when the sole object of church-going was sermon-hearing. For a Protestant congregation, no better system of church building could be devised than that developed by the successors of Wren. The first result of the revival of church teaching was of course to bring back the altar from its obscurity; for this purpose the pulpit had to be removed from the central position to one side. At the same time the reading-desk was separated from it and placed to match it on the other side. From the date of this separation a series of changes commenced, the object of which was not convenience but "correctness." The reading-desk was not to be found in the old churches, consequently it must be kept as much as possible out of sight in the new. From being a sort of rival pulpit, it was therefore gradually lowered; then the pulpit form was abandoned for a kind of auctioneer's box facing west, and by degrees, after passing through that glorious compromise called an L desk, it was turned to face north or south, according to the side on which it stood, and became a simple desk.

At the same time that these changes were going on, the choral arrangement was gradually being developed; and the introduction of choral services very soon showed the necessity of bringing the reader and the choir near together. This initiated another series of adventures for the reading-desk. It was first brought as near as possible to the chancel arch, then, there being no screen, placed on the step under the arch, and finally, the *acmè*

of correctness was reached by bringing the reading-desk into the chancel. But even there its position, being regulated by no definite system, constantly varies. It is sometimes at the west end of the upper choir desks, whereby the reader is in most churches placed in a corner behind the respond of the chancel arch. To avoid this the respond has sometimes been done away with, and the arch corbelled out, which has rarely a satisfactory appearance; sometimes again the reading desk is separated from the other choir fittings and brought forward amongst the boys, which produces an unpleasantly confused and unthought-about appearance, and also gives too great prominence to the reader, who, though the leader, is a member of the choir, and should be placed that he may appear to be one of them.

Where there is a screen, the difficulty of providing convenient approach to the reader's desk produces a further source of confusion. But it would be endless to describe the varieties or arrangement which make the choir-fittings in the majority of modern churches look as if they had been made for nowhere in particular, bought separately, and left just where they were put down, haphazard, by those who brought them in. In this matter it is probable that architects are not so often to blame as incumbents. At the present time every priest thinks he knows something about church architecture and arrangement. And let an architect plan as well as he may, it not unfrequently happens that the whole scheme is ruined by the ignorant interference of a well-meaning

man, who, if he would but be content to wait until it was carried out, would find that it suited all his requirements.

Of the choir arrangements now in common use, by far the best is that by which the seats are placed in two rows on each side, the clergy occupying the westernmost seats on the top row, and their seats being uniform with the others, but approached by a passage left in the desk, at about six feet from the west end. The merits of this are that it is orderly and systematic; that the clergy occupy, as they should do, the chief places in the choir, whilst at the same time their number may be varied as occasion requires. Where stalls of markedly different form from the rest are provided for the clergy, any who may be present over and above the regular number must take their seats amongst the lay singers. The practical defects of the arrangement are the one just pointed out, that the reader is usually cut off from the bulk of the people by the respond of the chancel arch, and that only the occupants of the westernmost stalls can conveniently address the congregation.

To get over these difficulties, I propose that the upper row of stalls should be returned at the west end of the chancel, as was invariably the case in the Middle Ages, and that the clergy should occupy them. By this means they are brought out quite into the middle of the church, and are as well placed for addressing the people as in the old central leading pew. The reader has only to turn round in his place at the necessary parts of the service fully to face the congregation, whilst, at those

times when he acts as the spokesman of the people, he appropriately turns the same way as they do. The returned stalls are all about equally advantageously placed, and as their number will generally more than equal the clerical staff of a parish church, each priest may have his own stall appropriated to him, and in it may take those parts of the service assigned to him from time to time.

I can see no reason why the lessons should not, under ordinary circumstances, be read from the stalls, and shall return to this subject when speaking of lecterns. A further advantage of the returned stall arrangement is, that it very considerably assists in the concentration of the æsthetic interest of the chancel or the altar. Stalls facing north and south only are at least neutral, even if they be not antagonistic to this concentration.

So far I have spoken almost exclusively of the stalls for the clergy, I now go on to consider with them the seats for the rest of the choir. I have used the word *stall* rather loosely. Properly it signifies the official seat of some personage in choir, but architecturally it has come to be used for all seats separated by elbows, and it will be convenient to continue its use in that sense. Modern stalls, however, should be very different from those used in the Middle Ages, and which are still often copied, where money can be found to pay for them. Old stalls were arranged as much for standing in as for sitting, and their peculiar form was contrived to suit a sort of half-standing position, now not used at all. The early custom was, as it is now in England, to stand dur-

ing the psalms of a choir office, but they were very long, and by degrees sitting came to be allowed at certain seasons, and under certain restrictions. Later, a support was allowed to be used at the times when the standing position was still retained. Thus originated the mediæval stall, with its small upper seat or *misericordia*,[1] and the high elbows intended to be used with it, and which without it are both useless and unmeaning. Modern stalls should have the elbows arranged to suit the seats now used.

Stall canopies also are now quite out of place in a parish church. They were used in the Middle Ages to protect the occupants of the stalls from cold and draughts during night offices, and must have been very necessary when no means were used for warming the churches. They were, I believe, entirely confined to monastic and collegiate churches, at least I do not remember an instance in a parish church. But, however that may be, they are quite out of place in a modern church, which ought to be properly warmed, and ought not to have its chancel cut off from the body of the church by a solid obstruction, as if it existed only for the use of the clergy. It has been reserved for modern "correctness" to introduce canopies without backs, which are as intelligent and useful an invention as a hat without a crown.

In richly-furnished churches all the upper row of seats may be stalls—*i.e.*, separated by elbows, but in ordinary churches stalls may be confined to the returned ends, and where funds are small these like the others may be

[1] The name shows the thing to have been an indulgence.

mere benches. The back row should be raised above the pavement from six to eighteen inches, according to the size of the church, and a passage should be left in the desk if required, but with returned stalls, both ends being open, this will not usually be necessary in churches of moderate size.

Most modern choir desks are too high, architects seem to forget that they are intended to be knelt at. The old examples are mostly exceedingly well proportioned, and as they are plentifully scattered about the country, and easily accessible, it will be sufficient to refer to them. The shelf to hold books, &c., often found under the old desks should not be omitted in modern ones, and care should be taken not to make the desks themselves too narrow.

During the Middle Ages the boys commonly stood in the choir, and although in late fittings we sometimes see benches provided for them, I do not know of any instance of boys' desks.[1] Modern churches should however be provided with both, making a second row in the choir. The floor of these should be lower than that of the upper row, and, in most cases, a little raised above the chancel pavement. The boys' seats may either be returned or not; generally in a broad chancel most accommodation is got by returning them, and in a narrow one by not doing so. The desks should be *bonâ fide* desks, capable of holding music-books, and not mere rails as many now are.

[1] The boys sang from memory, and consequently did not require books of music.

I have spoken of the chancel seats as being in two rows on each side, one or both being returned at the west, and in the large majority of cases this arrangement is the best. But peculiarities of site and other local circumstances may bring about many varieties. The only rule being in this, as in everything else, that what is most convenient is also most correct.

## *SECTION X.*

### OF THE ORGAN.[1]

THE position which is most suitable to the organ in a parish church may be considered from three points of view—namely, as it regards the choir, the congregation, and the acoustic qualities of the building.

In modern plans we find, as a rule, that the side of the chancel is the selected spot, and as regards the choir it cannot be better. The player is near the singers, and can readily communicate with them, whilst the sound of the voices and of the organ supporting and accompanying them pass out together into the body of the church. Whether the north or south side of the chancel be selected matters not. It is entirely a question of convenience in plan.

There are several modes which may be adopted for providing the necessary space for the organ. It may be generally asserted that an organ *chamber* is a mistake.

[1] This section has been written for me by Mr Somers Clarke, junior, who has made the organ a subject of special study, and is well-qualified to speak on it.—J. T. M.

It is usually to be found with an opening in front only, and without lateral escape for the sound. The opening, too, is not often lofty, being spanned by an arch which must be kept below the line of the chancel side walls. The best arrangement is to continue the north or south aisle eastward of the nave, keeping every opening into it both from chancel and body of the church as large as possible.

If there be no aisle carried on, a *recess*, not a deep chamber, should be used, with the walls carried up as high as those of the chancel, and the roof cutting into the main roof of the chancel, after the manner of a very shallow transept. A recess of some fifteen feet in length and six feet in depth will provide sufficient space for a fair-sized organ, and more room can be obtained by hanging the front forward beyond the line of the walls; an arrangement which not only adds to the appearance of the instrument and of the choir fittings, but is of service in developing the tone and musical effect. I think that in a church of medium size few ways can be adopted better than this.

The treatment of plan, which places the tower on one side of the chancel and provides for the organ within it, is one of the worst that can be devised.[1] The thickness of the walls, and necessarily contracted dimensions of

[1] Upon this point I am unable to agree with Mr Clarke. There is no reason why the lower story of a transceptal tower should not be quite as open as a transept without a tower over it. Of course there is a great difference between putting an organ under a tower which happens to be in this position, and arranging the tower on purpose for its reception.—J. T. M.

the arches, which can with safety be pierced through the lower part of the tower, shuts in the organ to a very serious extent. The space at command cannot be other than limited, and the sound which will penetrate a thin wall will be lost in the substance of the thicker.

In a few instances we find the whole of the instrument in the chancel, either hung out from above or standing on the floor, but corbeled out over head. This treatment is only admissible in a building of considerable width; its effect, musically, is very good.

The divided organ, one portion on the north and the other on the south side of the chancel, is occasionally to be found. This arrangement is one which entails a considerable outlay, as the long movement required to connect the various departments, and place them under the command of one player, is of great cost. In a church of medium size an organ of considerable magnitude may be disposed in this manner, so as to offer but little obstruction in the building, but unless the site be remarkably confined, I think that the architect should be able properly to provide for the instrument without having recourse to this expensive device. There is one marked advantage attending the division of the organ, and that is the assistance it gives in antiphonal singing. The sound coming first from one side of the church and then from the other, cannot fail to suggest to the congregation how matters are going in the choir. However, to carry out with completeness such a system, there should be four manuals, two of which should be choir organs, and an adequate pedal organ should stand

with each division, otherwise the disagreeable effect will be produced of the pedal parts only booming from one side of the building, while the rest of the sound proceeds from the other. To do this satisfactorily will require especial mechanical arrangements, or a double set of pedal keys, as we find occasionally in Germany, but this latter is a very inconvenient contrivance.

The two divisions of the organ can be placed either in the aisles of the chancel, or, in the case of a large building, may be projected from suitable galleries overhead, and by the assistance of the electric or atmospheric systems lately introduced, may be played from any convenient spot not necessarily in close proximity to either portion.[1]

As regards the congregation, and the aid they may receive from the organ, it has been argued that the west end of the church is the most suitable position. Undoubtedly, as far as the organ itself is concerned, the west end offers many advantages—ample space, with abundant height and room for the sound to spread,—but, on the other hand, a choir at one end of the building, with its accompanying instrument at the other, is an

[1] The divided system has been carried out most perfectly at All Saints', Margaret Street, Cavendish Square. Here there are to be found two choir organs, but the pedal arrangements are both imperfect and inadequate. I have never observed that the instrument has been used to assist the antiphonal character of the singing. At Westminster Abbey the arrangement is at least suggested. There the great organ stands on one side, the swell on the other; but there is only one choir organ, and that stands on the screen between the two larger divisions of the instrument. At St Paul's Cathedral, the organ, as now existing, is completely divided into two parts, but no arrangement whatever is made for use antiphonally. The pedal organ is all on one side, the choir on the other.—S. C.

obvious absurdity. A west singing gallery is a very objectionable feature, and except we adopt some such plan as this, the organ and singing cannot be kept together, unless the expensive arrangement be resorted to of erecting a small organ in the choir as well as the large instrument at the west end, and even that does not work well. The objections to the west end are, indeed, very serious. In the first place the organ is, practically, of no use to support the voices of the choir. Now, whilst it is sufficiently obvious that the singing of the congregation is not to be neglected, it must not be forgotten that their guide in singing must be the choir and organ combined. How this is to be satisfactorily accomplished when the two are removed from each other by an interval of perhaps from 150 to 200 feet, is not very obvious. In foreign churches, where the principal organ is at the west end, a small organ is, almost without exception, placed in the choir to assist the voices, or they are supported by a band. The large instrument is used, if one may be excused the expression, by way of a "flare up," and often gives the idea of being but very remotely connected with the service, although sometimes, no doubt, the effect is exceedingly magnificent. Where, in *fortissimo* passages, the voices are accompanied by it, the result is almost always a miserable failure. To those members of the congregation situated near the choir, a perceptible interval of time elapses between the sounding of the same note by the voices and the organ, even supposing, what is almost impossible, except by chance, that the voices and organ should

be keeping time together with mathematical accuracy. If, on the other hand, the auditor be at the west end, and the same accuracy of time be kept, the organ will first be heard. In actual practice, the player of the large instrument must, to a great degree, trust to chance. It is not uncommon to hear an interval of half a note between the voices of the congregation at the two ends of the nave, and the more the great organ is played the worse matters become.[1]

As regards the organ by itself, as I have just said, the west end offers considerable advantages, but with reasonable care any eastern position may be nearly as good. It is to be remembered that mere size is of little value. An organ containing but twenty stops, if advantageously placed, will tell better than one of forty stowed away in the regulation organ-chamber. It is of the first importance that there should be plenty of space both above and around the instument; this will display all the best qualities of tone, and, indeed, add to them an additional charm, whilst a dull, dry tone can alone be heard where space is too limited. An increase of power and shrillness will not remove the defect in any degree. The *quality* of tone is destroyed.

[1] That an intervening space much less than that of 150 or 200 feet, between two sources of sound, is very easily perceived by the ear, may be readily tested at the Albert Hall. If the listener place himself in the amphitheatre, which is about on a level with the band, and choose a position directly opposite to the orchestra, he will perceive that the sound of the organ reaches him at an infinitely small, yet distinctly perceptible interval of time after that of the band. Perpetually lagging, never going quite wrong, and never being quite right. A line taken from a point in the centre of the band to one in the centre of the organ cannot be more than about forty feet.—S. C.

Besides abundant room, the maintenance of an equal temperature is of moment, and to this end the walls round the organ should be built hollow, whilst a ceiling of wood should be used in preference to the usual open timber roof. Occasionally the whole of the walls near the organ are lined with wood, and when the position is confined the resonant lining is of use; it is certainly of value as tending to keep the instrument dry. If there be ample height, no effect is lost by placing the organ over a vestry. The resonant air-space thus gained underneath adds to the quality of tone. It is, however, considered preferable that the pedal stops should stand on the floor, but in any event a space should be excavated below the floor. Since the introduction of the blowing engine, this space is often utilised to accommodate it, but it is a very unsafe plan to put the bellows themselves below ground. The damp will certainly lead to their speedy decay. Where space can be had it is best to place the bellows in a separate apartment shut off from the church. There is nothing more disagreeable than to hear the heavy breathing sound accompanied by a desperate pumping, which one so frequently does at perhaps a particularly solemn part of the service.

In a large church it is occasionally found convenient to place the organ above the choir stalls; it is, however, a good thing to get the player not too far removed from the choir, and this may be done by placing the key-board behind or at one end of the stalls, whilst a long movement is used from the keyboard to the organ itself. Until lately there has been a great objection to the adop-

tion of such a scheme, in consequence of the immense elaboration and multiplication of mechanism which it involved; now it is a matter of expense alone. The electric action places the whole of the keys in direct communication with the mechanism of the organ, without the intervention of any elaborate movements, and the distance to which it may be carried is unlimited. But, unfortunately, it has not as yet been so fully perfected as to keep in order for any length of time, and continual repair means of course continual expense and annoyance.

The atmospheric system does not appear to be open to these objections. Instead of the electric wires or elaborate complications of "trackers," tubes transmitting compressed air are used. The compressed air acts upon elastic diaphragms, which convey the necessary motion to the valves that supply the pipes with wind. The action is instantaneous, and it appears to be free from liability to get out of order. It is, however, much more bulky than the electric movement.

In several instances long movements, electric or otherwise, have been used to connect the keyboard placed with the singers in the choir with the organ placed at a very considerable distance, even at the west end of the church. Although, mechanically, this is now perfectly feasible, musically, it is of doubtful advantage, as I have already shown.

The next subject to be considered is the architectural treatment of the organ itself. Modern fashion has decided that the organ shall not have any case at all. Our "Gothic" friends treat us to ugly pipe-stalks, mere

concatinations of zinc chimney-cans, sometimes with a little wire-drawn ironwork pretending to support them. The ugliness is occasionally emphasised by paint; an elaborate harlequinade of stripes and diamonds on a raw blue or red ground, called illumination, the whole affair being as ridiculous as it is unmeaning.

There can be no doubt that the organ should have a genuine case, and the design of this should be regulated by the internal arrangement of the various departments of the instrument. It is quite a mistake to suppose that the style of treatment just described is to be commended on the score of "true principles." I should imagine that it very probably came into favour on these grounds. And on the face of it, there is an apparent simplicity and straightforwardness likely to captivate the unwary.

The elements, so to speak, of an organ regarded from without, consist of the wood frame, containing the action, bellows, &c., and a row of pipes above, the simplest form of these being like a row of Panpipes. A little investigation of the instrument will, however, show that to adopt such a treatment of an organ now-a-days is merely to put on a cloak of simplicity at the expense of truth. The actual arrangement of the pipes is totally different from that which we see in such an outside. The builder has obligingly "arranged" the diapasons in front, and not only put the tallest pipe in the middle, but has made it several feet longer than it ought to be to enhance the architectural effect, and has cut away the back half of the pipe beyond its true speaking length to prevent its giving too deep a note. Nearly every other pipe in

the front is similarly treated, and not one will be found over its own wind-chest. So that we have come back once more to the same state of things as existed before "true principles" were thought about, and when in many instances the cases were at least works of art in their way.

As a rule, the organ in a medium-sized parish church will contain four departments—the great organ, the swell, the choir, and the pedal.

A very usual arrangement of these departments is (where there is depth from front to back) to put most of the pedal organ behind, the long pipes running nearly the whole height of the instrument, and standing on the floor. In front of this department is placed the choir organ, at a sufficient height from the floor level to admit of the bellows and reservoirs passing below it; we will suppose that it may be some five feet. Above this is placed the swell which, if it be of any size, will require a large box to contain it, which will consequently rise to a height nearly if not quite as great as the tops of the sixteen foot pedal pipes. In front of these departments we shall find the great organ with its wind-chest, on which the pipes stand, placed on a level with the top of the casing enclosing the lower part of the organ. This will be generally seven feet, or thereabouts, in height from the floor. This disposes of the various departments of the instrument, we will now see how the pipes are arranged. The most ordinary way is to divide the wind-chest into halves, leaving a passage board for facilities of tuning, up the centre. The smallest pipes are

placed next this board, and the largest at the farthest extremity, so that facing the organ we have an actual gap in the middle of a foot or more in width, and pipes rising from this in increasing lengths on either hand. In the swell organ, however, unless it be one of large dimensions, this order of arrangement is reversed, that expense may be saved in the size of the box, and the large pipes are in the centre, the smallest at the sides. The box is, therefore, usually shaped like a gable, with a flat top. Now, having described the arrangement so far, let us retire a few steps and look at our organ, divested of its artificially-disposed front pipes.

We shall see the great organ standing upon the panelling, with the pipes rising from nothing in the centre to some ten feet or more at the sides.[1] Through the centre gap will be seen the swell-box rising to a considerable height, and presenting a most unsightly appearance, with its dull surface of plain wood-work and ungainly truncated gable. Underneath we may catch sight of some longer pipes of the choir organ. The pedal will probably be but little in view, and, if seen, its large wood pipes are by no means beautiful. On the whole, the spectacle is one that is not pleasing, and presents many difficulties if we intend to deal with it as it stands.[2]

[1] I suppose that we are not dealing with sixteen feet double open stops on the manual. They only appear in large instruments, and do not affect the arrangement at all.

[2] Should the site on which the organ is placed, not admit of the pedal organ being arranged at the back, it is usually divided, and flanks the sides of the great and swell. This brings some large pipes at the two ends, and gives a somewhat improved appearance to the general effect,

We are brought then face to face, with the question, What is the truest and best architectural treatment of an organ?

To produce any effect with the pipes themselves, they must be removed from what I may call their *natural* position, and brought to the front. If there be large metal pipes in the pedal organ, and some of them to be brought forward, we are provided with plenty of material to work with, but we have at once lost the absolutely *natural* arrangement. It is found, however, that within certain limits the larger pipes do not suffer in tone or efficiency from being brought forward, or conveyanced off, as the organ builder terms it. The larger the pipe the greater is the gush of wind emitted from its mouth; and, consequently, the more space must there be in the vicinity of the mouth to admit of the pipe speaking clearly and firmly. By mounting the large pipes in the manner already noticed they not only had plenty of this necessary room, but from the direction in which their mouths were turned they could produce their sounds freely, without encroaching on the speaking room inside the case necessary to insure the correct enunciation of the interior pipe-work.[1]

We find ourselves then in this position. We may take the larger pipes, we will say those of the open diapason and a few others from the nearest sound board, and may avail ourselves of the large metal pipes

always supposing that these large pipes are of metal, which is by no means the case in every instance.—S. C.

[1] "The Organ, its History and Construction," E. J. Hopkins and E. F. Rimbault, LL.D., p. 278, ed. 1870.

in the pedal organ, but must not take them far from their natural places, or the wind becomes weakened and the tone uncertain. If we place the small pipes to the centre, and those of greater length towards the right and left, the internal arrangement is at least indicated, and the architectural effect will probably be best, but it is really a matter of taste. The main thing to keep in mind is, that if the organ stand within an arch we do not needlessly block it up, but leave as much open space as possible for the uninterrupted egress of sound.

In Italy, the case has very frequently but little relation to the actual length of the pipes which are in the front. A number of compartments is arranged, and the pipes are placed within them, not reaching to the top, but sloping at their natural length. The architectural effect is very good, and, saving that the pipes are not on their own wind-chests, there is nothing forced or artificial about the matter.

Where the space provided for the organ is shallow, and it is arranged in several stories, one above another, it is obvious that some indication of this should be discoverable from the outside, and most probably the effect of size will be greatly enhanced by adopting some such course.

There is nothing more deceptive than to bring a series of large pipes belonging to the great pedal stops, sixteen and thirty-two feet in length (those with the conical foot are really twenty and forty feet long), to the front, and to suppose that the display of these huge giants will give size.

The shape of a pipe, whether eight, sixteen, or thirty-

two feet in length, is virtually the same. It is simply a matter of magnifying, and there is nothing more destructive of true scale in architecture than mere magnifying. I cannot do better than to instance two examples to show how utterly without effect a large organ may be when this principle of art is ignored. The Handel Festival organ at the Crystal Palace is of unusual size, the front is not less than forty feet in width; but from the entire absence of any detail which indicates this fact, as also from the immense size of the building in which it stands, it is quite impossible to appreciate it. The great pipes in the towers appear but twenty feet or so in length, when, in point of fact, they exceed forty feet.

The same may be said of the organ at the Albert Hall. This is of even larger proportions than that at the Crystal Palace, but so badly is it arranged, and with so little regard to any true principle of effect, that it is quite impossible to appreciate it prodigious size. No one would conceive at first sight that the conical foot of the large pipes was much taller than a man. It must never be forgotten that the stature of a man is the true standard of scale.

The number of stops which an organ should contain must be regulated to a great extent by the dimensions of the building in which it is to stand, and the functions it is to perform. As an instrument for accompaniment only, a large number of stops is not needed. The tendency at the present day is to increase the list of fancy and solo stops at the expense of those which are of sterling value.

The most costly department of the instrument is the pedal organ. From the size of the pipes this must necessarily be the case; but it must be remembered that unless this section be of such magnitude as to form a sufficient bass to the others, the effect will be most seriously compromised, more particularly in the accompaniment of voices. Solidity and solemnity of effect will be lost.

The present fashion is to make the number of stops in the swell organ as large as that in the great, using a great many solo stops. The major part of these latter are of no use, saving for purposes of display. It would be a far better course to increase the pedals and use better materials in the work. The huge machines which we now see erected in churches of insignificant size are a perpetual source of expense, and are frequently so much too large for the space in which they are placed that the sound is less free, and the effect of the instrument is absolutely less telling and powerful than if it were considerably smaller.

For all ordinary purposes, four claviers will suffice—a great, swell, choir, and pedal clavier. Ostentation often gives us a fifth in the shape of a solo organ. This is all very well in a concert-room, but is quite unnecessary in a parish church, more especially as there is usually included in it that most noisy of stops, the *tuba mirabilis*, which should never be used but in a building of the first magnitude. In such an edifice the effect is majestic in the extreme, but it is quite out of place in a parish church.

Whilst there is really no necessity to have a solo organ, the importance of the pedal can hardly be over-estimated, as Forkel observes in his life of Bach: "The pedal is an essential part of the organ. By this alone it is exalted above all other instruments; for its magnificence, grandeur, and majesty depend upon it. Without the pedal, this great instrument is no longer great."

In Germany, where organ building is far better understood than in any other country, it is usual to find that a fourth part of the whole number of stops in the instrument is devoted to the pedal.

The harmonium has been no doubt the means of delaying the introduction of small organs into our churches in very many instances. For a given sum of money, more stops, with pretty names, may be had in a harmonium; but in the very best instrument of this class the quality of tone is so poor and nasal compared with that of a good diapason stop, that one cannot too strongly deprecate the substitution of the inferior instrument. An organ of one stop only is to be preferred before a harmonium. Instruments of the smallest class are now to be obtained from the best makers, and should the funds be wanting to put in more than one stop at first, it is easy to prepare for more and add them afterwards. The same system may be adopted with large instruments. Start with a good scheme at first, and gradually complete it. Additions to an already completed scheme are a mistake. The cost is much greater, and it is frequently the case that the additional

stops overtax the lungs of the organ, and mar the effect of the whole instrument.

I have already spoken of the introduction of solo and orchestral stops. There is an argument in favour of not including these amongst our list of stops, in the fact that the very best of them are but feeble imitations of the real instruments. And why should we not make use of the instruments themselves? Until the dismal groans of the harmonium were to be heard issuing from every village church, we had, in many instances, the village band. The double bass, violoncello, clarionet, and flute. The performance was no doubt bad; indeed, it was on a par with all the other matters connected with the conduct of public worship at that time, but reform was needed, and not total abolition. I trust it may not be long before we again hear some of these musical instruments in the church. Brass instruments have already begun to make their way.

## *SECTION XI.*

### OF LECTERNS.

IN one or other of their uses lecterns belong to each of the three main divisions: to the nave, when placed in the rood-loft, and also when used for holding the Bible from which the First and Second Lessons are read; to the chancel as the choir-leader's desk; and to the sanctuary when placed there to sing the Gospel from. It is, however, convenient to discuss them all together.

The use of the lectern for reading the Lessons from at matins and evensong being common to almost all the churches in England, it may seem presumptuous to object to it; nevertheless, I can see no sufficient reason for it under ordinary conditions. The custom seems to date from the early part of the seventeenth century, and must, I think, be classed with tuns, tricanales, Adam-and-Eve[1] alms-basons, "triquertral" censers, cushioned altars, coped celebrants, and such like ecclesiastical curiosities of that strange period. The rubric merely orders the reader so to stand and turn himself "as he may best be heard of all those that are present." No order is given to him to leave his place,

[1] Or "the two spies." Of the many such basons still to be found in our old churches, I do not remember an instance with any other than one of these two subjects. What was their origin and meaning?

and if he can be heard from it, there seems to be no object in his doing so. If his position is such that he cannot be heard, he must of course change it, but this need rarely happen in a parish church. When it does, the pulpit may reasonably be used for the Lessons. This must stand where the reader may best "be heard of all those that are present." Usually they may be read from one of the returned stalls, the reader turning west if there be a congregation in the nave, east if no one is present except in the choir. If a lectern is insisted upon, it should be placed in the nave, somewhere near the pulpit or on the other side opposite to it. The "correct" place—the middle of the chancel—is bad for hearing from, and it is also, as we shall shortly see, wanted for another purpose.

The argument I have already given, when speaking of the rood-loft, in favour of providing a special place for the reading of the Gospel, may possibly be used to justify doing the same for the Lessons. But I think to give like honour to all Lessons taken from Holy Scripture, takes away from its special meaning when applied to the Gospel.

With an elaborate musical service a conductor is a necessity. If his office be not openly recognised, and a place assigned to him, he must get on as well as he can in his stall, which is never a good, and often a very bad, place to be seen from by the choir, being in the same line with some singers, and behind others. Now, it is contrary to the first principles of rational planning that any ordinary requirement should be unforeseen and un-

provided for. We must, therefore, inquire how the conductor, or, if it be preferred to call him so, the choir-ruler, may be best accommodated. He must be fully in sight of the choir, and, consequently, must stand in the middle of the chancel. He must be so far forward that those occupying the eastern stalls may be guided by him when they are turned towards the altar. And he requires a desk for his book that his hands may be free. All these wants will be supplied by a lectern placed half-way between the easternmost stalls,[1] the conductor will be visible to every member of the choir, and also to musicians, if placed in the rood-loft.

The conductor's desk should face east, which is practically quite as convenient as if he faced the choir, and at the same time marks that the music is but a means to an end, the end being worship, and the conductor just as much a worshipper as any of the congregation. Nothing can possibly be more contrariant to every idea of devotion than to see a man, as may now and then be done at "special" cathedral services, with his back to the altar, gesticulating violently in full view of the congregation. It is this utter want of all feeling of *worship*, not any elaboration of musical performance, which lays our churches open to the charge of being concert-rooms.

The conductor should be as little conspicuous as possible, considering his position. He only requires to be

[1] This lectern is identical with the antiphon desk of the later Middle Ages, and where antiphons are sung it may continue to be used as such. It should have two desks, and be made to turn so as to accommodate two books.

seen by the choir, not by the congregation, his desk should therefore be small, and should stand on the floor of the chancel. A large lectern, or one raised on a platform in this position, would, except in buildings on a very great scale, take off from the importance of the altar.

A lectern was, during the Middle Ages, often placed on the north side of the sanctuary for the reading of the Gospel, at those times when the loft was not used. In the twelfth century it was moveable, and brought in only when wanted,[1] but in later times it became permanent, and was sometimes a magnificent piece of furniture. There seems to be every reason why this custom should be kept up in our more richly-furnished churches, and a desk may also be provided on the other side of the sanctuary for the Epistle. But if so, it should be smaller and in every way less important that the other. The same subordination of the Epistle to the Gospel should also be observed in the rood-loft, where standing lecterns will be found more practically convenient than desks fixed to the parapet. It would, I think, also be well that the eagle form should be confined to lecterns used for the Gospel, as seems to have been the general rule in the Middle Ages.[2]

[1] See S. Osmund's treatise on the services, printed by Dr Rock at the end of his "Church of our Fathers," cap. xcv. ". . . Evangelium non in pulpito in aquila (cantatur), sed in presbiterio super pulpito apparato, versus aquilonem converso diacono, quod unus cerophera riorum post lectam epistolam in loco debito disponat et ornet . . ." Several ancient lecterns remain, which might be used in this way. M. Viollet-le-duc has figured two in his "Dictionnaire du mobilier," tome i., art. "Lutrin."

[2] We continually find the word "aquila" used alone for the Gospel lectern

A lectern may be either of wood, iron, or cast brass, of which the last is the best, but the most costly. The desks should in most cases be made to turn, and it will add much to the comfort of using it if two cords, weighted at the ends, be attached to the top, so that they may be laid over the leaves of the book and so keep it open. Besides those with special uses, a light moveable lectern of wood or wrought-iron will be found convenient in many ways in a church.

but never, so far as I have observed, for the Epistle lectern. See, for instance, the passage quoted in the last note. Also Durandus "Rationale," book iv., chapters 16–24, *passim*. De Honecort, in his sketch-book, has left us drawings of two eagles, both of which are described as Gospel desks (see Professor Willis's edition plates, xii. and xliii.) In a series of contemporary drawings of the funeral of Abbot Islip in 1533, engraved in the fourth volume of the "Vetusta Monumenta," is one showing the sanctuary and high altar of Westminster Abbey. On the north side is an eagle desk, seemingly of brass, and of the usual form. There is no lectern of any kind for the Epistle; and other similar instances might be quoted. Having mentioned the examples in De Honecort, I will venture to point out what seems to me to be a slight misunderstanding on the part of his English editor as to the contrivance in plate xliii. I think the head of the bird was turned merely by the placing of the book on its back, the lower part of which appears to be movable, and is connected with the string and pulley in such a way, that by depresing the back, as would be done by the weight of the book, the head would be turned. A "puerile device," indeed, as Professor Willis calls it, but not quite so bad as to make the deacon stop before singing the Gospel to pull a lever.

## *SECTION XII.*

### OF THE CHANCEL LEVELS AND STEPS.

BOTH practically and æsthetically it is of the highest importance that these should be well considered. The prevailing idea now seems to be that it matters little where steps are placed, if only there are plenty of them. A well-elevated altar is usually and rightly asked for. But no greater mistake can be made than to imagine that this may be obtained by simply raising it above the level of the nave floor. It is quite possible, merely by adding steps, to destroy the whole dignity of the altar as seen from the body of the church. A great rise at the entrance to the chancel is certain to bring this about, and with a deep sanctuary many steps just outside the altar-rail are almost equally prejudicial, especially if, as is often the case, the rail extends all across the chancel, and the floor beyond it is comparatively flat. In order that the steps may have their fullest effect in increasing the importance of the altar, they must be placed as far east as possible, and almost always they should be more numerous inside than outside the rail. The number of steps will vary greatly according to the size and character of the church. A lofty building may have many, but in small churches of the usual type less is often gained by raising the floor than is lost by the conse-

quent diminution in the internal height of the sanctuary walls. In such a case, the maximum effect will often be obtained by using only four steps, one at the entrance to the chancel, a second at that of the sanctuary, and two within it, the first not less than three feet east of the rail, and the other about three feet in front of the altar.

All steps which are added in larger churches should be developed out of these four. The first may become two or three, generally two, and rarely, if ever, more than three, and in very small buildings it may sometimes be entirely omitted. The step at the entrance to the sanctuary must always remain one. Nothing can possibly be more inconvenient for communicants, especially infirm persons, than the now not uncommon arrangement of a rise of two or three steps immediately outside the altar-rail. In very rare instances it may be desirable to add other steps between the rood-screen and the altar-rail. But if so, they must be placed at the eastern end of the stalls, and a platform of at least four feet wide be left between them and the sanctuary step. The side gates of the chancel, by which communicants pass out, must open directly on to this platform.

In considering the steps of the sanctuary, it will be most convenient to begin at the east. The highest of our four normal steps is what is commonly called the foot-pace, and it is mostly returned, that is, it does not go the whole width of the sanctuary. The object of this returning is to make the step form a sort of base for the altar to stand upon, and so increase the importance of its appearance. But where the chancel is so

narrow as to leave only a few feet between the ends of the altar and the side-walls, it is most convenient for the steps to run all across. In large churches a second, and sometimes a third returned step may be added. Care must be taken to make the top one broad in front, where the celebrant stands. Four feet will be found a good width. If it be less than three feet there is a risk of the priest's foot slipping over the edge, which is uncomfortable and often dangerous. The second and third steps, known respectively as the gospeller's and the epistoler's, require to be broad enough to be walked along. About two feet will be found a convenient width. At the sides the steps need not be more than about a foot wide, as they are only required for ascent and descent. The platform at the top should not be much wider than the length of the altar, for if so, the base-like effect is destroyed; but a few inches of projection at each end will be found convenient, and looks better than if the step is exactly the length of the altar.

About two feet below the foot-pace should be placed the third of our four steps. Where an elevated altar is required, it is here that the great rise should be made. This step may become half-a-dozen, or even more, and yet every step have its due effect in dignifying the altar. But care must be taken to leave a broad, level space between the lowest step and the altar-rail, so that the clergy may with ease pass one behind another when communicating the people.

It is best that the level of the choir floor should be at least one step above that of the chancel aisles; there

will, therefore, be a descent at the north and south chancel gates. And generally there should be but one step from the nave aisle to the chancel aisle, lest, by the elevation of the latter and its contents, the pre-eminence of the chancel should be interfered with.

The rise of the steps will vary according to circumstances. There may be sometimes artistic reasons for preferring four low steps to three high ones. But for convenience no step should rise less than five inches or more than eight. That upon which the altar-rail stands should not be less than six inches high.

## *SECTION XIII.*

### OF THE ALTAR-RAIL.

THE rail was introduced in the seventeenth century as a fence to the altar, and as such it should be now retained in all churches where the chancels are imperfectly screened; but in properly furnished churches it is not wanted for this purpose. It is, however, useful as a support to infirm persons when kneeling at the sanctuary step, and therefore should not be entirely done away with. A few feet of rail at each end of the step is all that will be wanted, as only a small number of people require it. Where there are special reasons for carrying it across the chancel, a wide gate should be provided in the middle.

The rail should be two feet to two feet six inches high, and should stand one foot from the edge of the sanctuary step. If it is meant to serve as a screen, it should be close in design. Sometimes, instead of a fixed rail, two short moveable lengths are placed on the step when wanted. These are not to be commended; they are not really safe, and a treacherous support is worse than none.

The material for the altar-rail may be either wood, marble, iron, or cast-brass. It need not be reduced so as to be scarcely visible, as is often done; on the contrary,

where it can be afforded, this is often a good place for richness. A well-managed altar-rail may add much to the dignity of the altar. A turned wood rail often looks very well; and it is scarcely credible that "correctness" should have caused so many really good altar-rails of this sort to be turned out of our old churches, to make way for vile tailors' trash, in the shape of what are called "iron standards."

## *SECTION XIV.*

### OF THE ALTAR.

THE size, material, and form of the altar, each require consideration. Most modern altars are too low and too broad; in length they are generally better, although here they generally err by being too short. The height and width should be regulated by the convenience of the celebrant, and, consequently, should vary only within small limits. But the length is not so affected, and may vary almost indefinitely, according to the size and character of the church.

The common mistake is to treat the altar as a table. But tables are meant to sit at, whilst every act done at the altar is done standing; consequently, what is a convenient height for an ordinary table must necessarily be too low for an altar. In spite of this apparently obvious objection, it is by no means uncommon to see altars very little higher than a common dining-table. In the newer churches this is generally somewhat exceeded, and the most usual height is about three feet. A few architects make it as much as three feet three, or at most four inches, but an altar above this height is seldom seen. This maximum of three feet four inches should really be the minimum. An altar lower than this will compel a priest

of average stature to stoop inconveniently over it. Three feet five inches is better, and is perhaps the best general height. I have made altars as high as three feet six inches, and their convenience is favourably reported on by the clergy using them. But I think this is the highest limit, as three feet four inches is the lowest.

The width of an altar should not be great; two feet is sufficient to celebrate on, and any additional width given to the altar is so much taken from the length of the sanctuary, which is now oftener too short than too long. And, further, it is desirable to be able to reach over the altar, which cannot conveniently be done if it is more than two feet six inches wide. About two feet three inches will be found a good ordinary width. If the ledge stand upon the altar, the width of the latter must be correspondingly increased.

The high altar should be sufficiently long to make it appear decidedly and unmistakably the principal object at the east end of the church. It may take up from one-third to one-half of the width of the sanctuary. In a large church one-third is enough, but the proportion should increase as the chancel becomes narrower; and no high altar should; even in the smallest church, be less than eight feet long, otherwise the priest, gospeller, and epistoler, standing side by side in front of it, will completely conceal it. A side-altar, at which there are none but low celebrations, may be as little as five feet long its height and width being determined by the same rules as the other.

There has of late years been much, as it seems to me,

unnecessary, disputing about the materials of which the altar should be made, some insisting that it must be wood, others that the whole, or at least the top, must be stone. Very good arguments may be produced in favour of each. The rubric, in directing that "the chancels shall remain as they have done in the times past," distinctly orders that the altar shall be of stone; for in "times past," *i.e.*, before the translation of the services, none but stone altars were known in English churches. But this rubric seems never to have been generally acted upon, and for the last three centuries stone and wood have been used indiscriminately. Until the general desecration of churches by the Puritan faction during the civil wars, many of the ancient stone altars still continued in use; but such new ones as were erected appear to have been usually of wood, as were also nearly all of those which were set up in the churches on their restoration to sacred uses, between 1660 and 1662. From that date until within the last forty years the altars were in most cases of marble, or with marble tops, supported on ironwork. In recent times wood has been more common, although now the fashion is rapidly changing in favour of stone.

Passing over the authority of the rubric, the main arguments in favour of stone are the example of the rest of western Christendom, and the unseemliness of the principal object in the church being less permanent and durable in character than those of only secondary importance—namely, the font, which is always, and the pulpit, which is often, of stone. In favour of wood may

be cited the common, if not general, usage of the early church, but chiefly that the altar upon which the great Sacrifice was first offered up—the cross itself—was of this material.

Within the last few years a curious combination has become very common. The top or altar-slab is of stone, whilst the framework supporting it is of wood. This seems to have its origin in the singular but wide-spread superstition that the altar must not be fixed. Now, common sense dictates that it shall not be moveable. To meet these two not very harmonious requirements, men have endeavoured to make the altar, whilst really a separate piece of furniture, "ponderous and fixed by its own massy weight." But a wooden top of sufficient thickness to effect this is almost certain to wrap and crack, to avoid which architects often substitute stone. This standing of stone upon wood is, however, not to be commended as a rule, although a small altar may often be conveniently increased in height and length by placing a stone slab on the top of it.

Whatever be their material, altars should be perfectly simple in design. Elaborately-sculptured altars are of quite modern introduction, and I know of no sufficient argument in their favour. They are liable to catch the vestments of the clergy moving about them, and in appearance they are much inferior to altars vested in the usual manner. It is quite true that the altar should be equal, if not superior, in costliness to the other objects in the church, but this may be brought about by the use of valuable material.

A massive slab of rich marble, carried upon pillars of gilded bronze, will form an altar suitable for the most expensively furnished church. A slab carried on pillars is, I think, the best form for a stone altar; but it may be carried on walls, or on solid masonry.

If the altar is of wood, it should be framed like a large heavy table and not like a packing-case. But, above all, it must be simple and straightforward in design, and no such childish absurdities allowed as open traceried fronts, *behind* which, *frontals* stretched on frames are pushed in end-wise, like slides into a magic lantern, "according to the colour of the season."

The slab of an altar, whether of wood or stone, must not be moulded on its upper edge, but kept perfectly square; moulding here not only looks bad and renders the fitting of the altar vestments impossible, but it is very likely to cause accidents from the fall of things placed near the edge.

Ancient altar-slabs have usually five rude crosses cut in them, which mark the places anointed by the bishop at the consecration. The reproduction of these crosses on unanointed altars is unmeaning.

It is now usual to place the altar-cross and candlesticks, not upon the altar itself, but upon a sort of ledge or shelf raised a few inches above it. For this ledge I know of no special mediæval name, although it was in use at least as early as the fifteenth century, and as none of the "correct" names[1] happen in this case to be correct,

[1] Until within the last three or four years it was always called the super-altar, and although *superaltare* has usually another meaning, I have very

I shall speak of it simply as the "altar-shelf." It adds very considerably to the importance of the altar, and should therefore be retained, but it should not be made part of the altar itself for reasons which cannot easily be explained, without entering at length into the question of the vesting of the altar. If the shelf is to be on the altar it must be loose, but I think it is better that it should be behind the altar, in which case it becomes part of the reredos, and must be considered with it. Sometimes, however, the former is the preferable method, especially when altering an existing building; for most modern sanctuaries are too short, and the altars quite broad enough to allow of the shelf being placed on them, whereby we avoid the reduction of the available length of the sanctuary consequent upon bringing forward the altar so as to place a reredos behind it. The best form for an altar-shelf of this kind is a wooden box, the length of the altar, and from nine to twelve inches broad, and from four to eight high.

little doubt that, if a mediæval Latin writer had had occasion to speak of the altar-shelf, this is the word which he would have used. Recently, however, our "correct" friends have discovered, I don't know how, that this word is *not* correct, and they now with one consent laugh to scorn the benighted few who still retain it; whilst they themselves speak of the altar-shelf as the "Rē—table," with a very long *e* and a pause after it, seemingly from a notion that it is a kind of *table* to put things on. The word *retable* is French, and about equivalent to our *reredos* as now commonly used; *table=tabula*, not *mensa*. I do not remember to have met the Latin form *retabulum*, although it is frequently used by moderns, especially when speaking of the well-known relic of thirteenth-century English art at Westminster, which is generally considered to be a "retable," but which I venture to think a frontal.

## *SECTION XV.*

### OF THE REREDOS.

IT may possibly be thought that the reredos ought to be classed amongst the purely decorative features of a church. It has, however, or at least it may have, a certain practical use, in consideration of which, and also of its great importance in the composition of the interior, it is fairly entitled to be ranked with the furniture of the building. A bad reredos will ruin the best church ever designed; and, although a good reredos cannot convert a bad church into a good one, it may do much to lessen the offensiveness of its badness.

As the word *reredos* is now ordinarily used, it means a more or less ornate wall or screen placed behind the altar, to which it should give increased dignity, but which, in not a few modern instances, it crushes into insignificance, whilst it monopolises the whole interest to itself. The fault arises from the non-recognition of the proper function of a reredos. We will, therefore, begin by inquiring what this is.

In a large apartment a small object is by itself necessarily unimportant, and if we wish to draw special notice to it, we must provide some other object of sufficient size to attract the attention, and so placed as to carry down the eye of the spectator to the first. Thus,

in the House of Lords, a chair, the use of which prevents its being very large, is surmounted by a canopy and becomes the throne, strikingly the principal object in the place. Just so it is in a church—the dimensions of the altar are limited, especially in the most important direction of height; we must, therefore, add something which shall first draw the attention to itself, and then *focus* it upon the altar. In a church of ordinary size, a good reredos is the best means of effecting this, but a well-managed cloth dossal will do it almost equally well, and should always be preferred to a cheap reredos. A reredos is a luxury. If you can afford it, have it; if you cannot honestly go without it, do not make-believe with a shabby-genteel substitute. The evidence of poverty in essentials is no disgrace, but in superfluities it is tawdry and mean, qualities which, hateful everywhere, are doubly so in the sanctuary.

The reredos may take an almost infinite variety of forms. It may either stand against the east wall, or be in advance of it; it may be but little longer than the altar, or it may extend all across the sanctuary; it may be only a few feet in height, or it may cover the whole east end; it may be of stone, wood, marble, alabaster, bronze, earthenware, or, indeed, of almost any material; and it may be decorated with painting and sculpture, singly or combined. It would be impossible, even if I wished it, to lay down any general rules as to the designing of a reredos; I shall, therefore, confine myself to the general consideration of the chief requirements, with the view of determining the best means of meeting them.

As the purpose of the reredos is to give dignity to the altar, our first care must be to ensure that it does so effectually. Now, if it is too large, it will not do this; we want something intermediate in size between the altar and the east end of the church, but nearer to the former than to the latter. If, therefore, our reredos is to cover the whole or the greater part of the east wall, we must have a further concentration—a sort of reredos within a reredos—as in fact we find in the magnificent examples still standing, though shorn of their imagery, at St. Alban's Abbey and Winchester Cathedral.[1] This inner reredos is indeed the reredos proper, and is identical with small reredos of ordinary type, the larger erection being strictly an ornamental treatment of the east wall of the sanctuary. We will, therefore, postpone the consideration of the larger until after the discussion of the smaller.

The reredos proper should not greatly exceed the altar in length, or it will lose the effect of belonging exclusively to it. In height it may vary greatly, according to circumstances, but as a rule it should not be very high. If the building requires a high erection in this place, it is better to make use of the *double* reredos

[1] At St Alban's this inner reredos consists of a row of thirteen small niches, totally different in scale and treatment from the great reredos, and separated from it by a strongly-defined cornice. Below the niches, immediately over the altar, is a plain space of wall, which was furnished with a "table" either of wood carved and painted, or it may be of silver gilt. After having examined the reredos at Winchester, I believe a similar arrangement exists there, though it is hidden by a modern painting; and the analogy between it and that at St Alban's is in all points so complete, that one is led to believe that they resemble also in this.

just described. By this means greater importance is given to the altar, and there is less danger of destroying the scale of the building.

A reredos consists of two parts. The base, or portion which occupies the space behind the altar, and rising a few inches above it, is now commonly arranged so as to form a shelf, and the upper enriched part, which it will be convenient to distinguish as the *retable*.[1] These require separate consideration.

The shelf has a value even if looked upon simply as a well-defined line between the altar and the retable, but it is also of considerable practical importance.

Nothing ought to stand upon the altar except what is actually used during the service, if for no other reason because everything so placed has to be taken away every time the altar-linen is changed. By placing the candlesticks and such ornaments on the shelf this is avoided, and at the same time the apparent height, and consequently the comparative importance of the altar, is increased without the inconvenience and loss of scale which would result from the undue elevation of the altar itself. The altar-shelf is not found in mediæval reredoses, at least I am not aware of an instance. The nearest approach to it I know is at Grantham Church, in Lincolnshire, where, in an underground chapel, is an

[1] I do not use this word very willingly, for I know of no good English authority for it, and, as I have pointed out in a recent note, "correctness" gives it the very meaning in contradistinction to which I am here using it. But no other word occurs to me as equally distinctive, the only likely one, *dossal* or *dorsal*, is now commonly used only of a hanging of cloth or silk.

altar with a step at the back one and a-half inches high, and five and a-half inches broad, and six inches above this is a second ledge, one foot wide, formed in a window-cill. Drawings of the fifteenth century often show steps rising some height at the backs of altars. They are generally represented as covered with some sort of cloth, and in all probability were usually wooden boxes, such as I have described in the section treating of the altar. The necessity for the altar-shelf was not much felt in the Middle Ages, for, instead of the multitude of candlesticks and flower vases with which an altar is now decked, nothing but the crucifix and two, or, I believe, at the utmost six, lights was then placed upon it.

The height of the shelf above the altar may vary, according to circumstances, from about four inches to a foot; I do not think it ever should exceed that. To carry candlesticks, &c., conveniently, it should not be less than nine inches broad, and twelve is better. Sometimes a second shelf may be added above and behind the first; this gives more scope for the decoration[1] of the altar,

[1] I am no admirer of altars bristling with candles, and crowded with flower-pots and *bouquets*, till they look like stalls in Covent Garden Market. They are little less offensive than altars covered with a lot of useless plate like a sideboard, a fashion which seems to reach its climax at St George's Chapel, Windsor, on the occasion of a state wedding. But there can be no doubt that a reasonable number of extra lights and vases of cut flowers, tastefully arranged, are a very beautiful and appropriate decoration for the altar on festivals. The fault here, as in nearly all our modern art, is that men will mistake means for ends, they forget that they are decking the altar, and think only of putting candles and flowers upon it, and consequently imagine that the more they put on the better they succeed. It would be well if every altar had a definite scheme for its

and also is of advantage in keeping the lights, which should be confined to the lower shelf, forward at a distance from the retable, thereby preserving it from smoke stains. This last-mentioned precaution is one of no slight importance where the retable is such as cannot be cleaned without injury. For though a single candle does not make much smoke, the altar lights being in constant use, and always in the same places, very soon cause black marks to appear over them on any object which stands too near them. These stains may often be seen going up the east wall for a considerable height over each of the principal candlesticks, and where many lights are used, the whole space above the altar is blackened. The only remedy is to keep the lights some distance away from the wall.

Not unfrequently a difficulty arises in arranging the ornaments, especially where there are two shelves, owing to the necessity for reaching over the altar to get at them. This is partly, but not altogether, caused by the unnecessary width of most modern altars. I have noticed that in a few churches to avoid it the altar has been drawn forward, so as to leave a narrow passage between it and the reredos, thereby providing easy access to the latter, but inconveniently reducing the width of the footpace in front. In future buildings it would of course be easy to provide for this position of the altar, where sufficient length can be given to the sanctuary; but I think it would be very much better not to place the passage between the altar and the reredos, but to separate the

decoration, which should be constantly adhered to, the choice of flowers being alone left to the discretion of the decorators.

shelf from the retable, and bring it forward together with the altar. The shelf would thus take the form of a wall about the same length as, and a little higher than, the altar, and separated from the retable by a narrow passage. By this arrangement not only would a convenient access to the altar-shelf be provided, but all danger of disfigurement to the retable by the smoke from the candles would be taken away, and further, it would be possible to get at the retable itself, if necessary, without either moving the altar or standing upon it, as I have seen done. The passage need not be more than about fourteen inches wide, and I think it would be found most convenient if raised two or three steps above the floor on which the altar stands.

The altar-shelf ought always to be provided whether there is a retable or not. In a simply-furnished church a marble altar-shelf, surmounted by a good dossal, looks much better than a costly reredos. The best form perhaps is that with two shelves or ledges, the upper of which may be ornamented on its "riser" with panelling or carving.

The designing of a retable does not seem so great a matter, and, but for my experience of modern churches, I could scarcely have believed there were so many ways of not doing it. After that experience I am really puzzled to know with what to begin the discussion of the subject. The great failing of the majority of modern reredoses is, that they are utterly unmeaning, whether viewed dogmatically or æsthetically. They neither teach anything, nor fill any place in the harmony of the

building in which they stand. They are not unusually profusely decorated with canopies, crockets, finials, shafts, caps, and carvings of all sorts, and indeed there is any quantity of *detail*, but no *design* whatever. Sculpture may be used, but it is as carved panels, not as sculpture. Instead of giving the keynote of the whole, it simply decorates blank spaces, with no more special fitness for its position than have the paintings at a Royal Academy Exhibition; instead of the niches enshrining the statues, the statues fill up the niches, and every "subject" might be changed for another of the same size, without the difference being appreciable. I am not here speaking of the wretched affairs with which country parsons and churchwardens are now and then beguiled, *pour leurs péchés*, into purchasing from advertising tailors, but of works which are in many respects of real merit. Sometimes the sculpture is in itself fairly good, the carving good, the material good, and even the architecture good in its way; the fault is that, as is the reredos, so every one of its constituent parts is designed for itself alone, without the least respect to, or even recognition of, the function which it has to perform. The whole is paralysed. The members have no connection with one another or subjection to the head, even if, which is not always the case, there is a head for them to be subject to.

Want of purpose is a negative fault, but there are positive ones, which really spring from the same cause. The commonest and most fatal is that by which the relative values of the altar and the reredos are reversed,

and, instead of the retable being as it were a *crown* to the altar, the altar is made to appear as a mere base to the retable. The non-recognition of the proper function of the reredos almost necessarily produces this result; for, if the interest of the retable is centred in itself, its greater size, and more elaborate treatment, and generally also richer material, cannot fail to draw the attention from the altar to it; whereby, whatever be its intrinsic merits, it becomes, instead of an ornament, a positive and unmixed evil in the church. The evil is often greatly aggravated by the injudicious way in which sculpture is used, both in choice of the subjects represented and mode of representing them. All *pictures*—that is, historical representations, whether in painting or sculpture, are wrong over the altar. There are many parts of the church in which they are not only admissible but desirable. But a picture asks, and ought to deserve, special attention; it should, therefore, be where it may receive its due share of notice, without injury to the æsthetic supremacy of the altar. If it be placed over the altar, it is in the very *focus* of the building, and is certain to usurp the place of the altar, and become the most important object in the church. It must, of course, be understood that I am here speaking of pictures of sufficient size really to enter into the composition of the building. Small "subjects," which can only be seen from distances, at which the altar, merely from its bulk, is able to maintain its independence, may safely be used; but it rarely happens that a reredos can be entirely made up of these. It *ought* to have a value in

the composition of the building, which it will not if its parts be frittered away into insignificance. If sculpture or painting are used, they must be restrained by the severest discipline. The highest obtainable art should be employed, but it must be chastened and held under strict rule; all must be perfectly calm and sober, the grouping and attitudes[1] conventional, and without violent action; in a word, the architectural, if I may so call it, must here dominate over the natural, and the dramatic must be entirely excluded. It is furthermore necessary that the whole should have a distinct purpose and meaning, and these with direct reference to the altar and the Holy Sacrifice thereon offered.

Bad as is a picture or group of figures dominating over the altar, the case is ten thousands times worse when instead of a group we have a single statue; yet this is far from being uncommon either in England or abroad. At home it is generally a seated figure called a "Majesty," on the continent more often the standing image of a saint. This last is not altogether unknown here; but, as I do not remember an instance of it in a very virulent form, and as some of the arguments against the seated will also condemn the standing figure, I will confine myself to the consideration of the former. The "Majesty" cannot be set down as unmeaning, like the majority of "subjects" and pictorial representations in the same situations; on the contrary, it does convey a meaning,

[1] I hope that no one will understand me to commend those distorted figures, which our fathers thought essential to *Gothic art*. Conventionality means restraint, not falsification.

and that a most distinct and easily comprehended, though an unintended and most offensive one. Let us consider impartially what the teaching of this figure is, laying aside for a season all preconceived ideas derived from our own Christianity, and assuming the position, not of an imaginary New Zealander, but of an ordinarily intelligent Englishman, who, having been educated in one of the sects, has for the first time in his life wandered into a church, and is endeavouring to understand what he sees. Entering the church as a congregation are assembling, an inquirer first observes that all kneel or sit facing in one direction; in that direction he looks, and sees the chancel screened off from the rest of the church as more especially holy; the service begins, he sees the vested ministers take their places in the chancel; prayers are said, still towards the same point; and he sees ceremonies, to him unintelligible, being performed about some object at the extreme end of the chancel, which he naturally concluded to be the centre towards which the worship is directed. He looks more closely, and what does he find? There is a small elevated platform covered with silk or velvet, and throned above it, and apparently using it for a footstool, is a large image. What is this image? Does it teach anything? Does it lead the attention to anything else? No. It sits there as solidly as Memnon amongst the sands of Thebes; it is a passive not an active being, a recipient not a teacher; our inquirer can best regard it as the *god*. And so it is. It is neither more nor less than a carved idol. It is no reply to say that there is now no danger

of its being so understood, and at the worst it is but a sin against good taste. Amongst the uneducated in the faith there *is* such danger.

So far I have chiefly spoken of retables of the more costly description, but there are many degrees of them, from the gorgeously-sculptured and inlaid alabaster of the cathedral to the couple of square yards of tile pavement stuck on edge over the altar in a district church. It would be too great a task to discuss these in order, nor would it be very profitable. Some of the lower grades have, as was just now hinted, no valid claim to existence. The commonest faults are tameness and vulgarity, generally separated, but occasionally most ingeniously combined. The first is comparatively harmless; its usual symptoms are lambs, doves, pelicans, calves, eagles, lions, angels (so called), interlacing triangles, *A*s, Ωs, IHSs, XPCs,[1] &c., spotted about without rhyme or reason. Beyond what may be gathered from the vague statement that they are *symbolical*, the information as to what they symbolise, or in what way they are suitable to their places, can rarely be obtained; as for the two monograms the first is almost invariably interpreted wrongly, and the other, although possessed of several nicknames, is usually a complete poser. The vulgarity

[1] The use of these devices is not in itself to be condemned, but the ignorant and purposeless use. With the exception of the dove and the triangles, all those named may be properly introduced into retables. Two (the Lamb and the Pelican) are particularly suitable, and although not of equal authority—one being, according to M. Didron's very just distinction, really a symbol and the other only an emblem—may be used together as symbolising respectively *sacrifice* and *communion*.

is, I am sorry to say, often wilful and deliberate, and belongs to a subject too large to be entered upon in this place. It is one of the least hopeful features of modern art that there exists amongst us a large number of men, some of them of real, though perverted ability, who mistake coarseness for vigour, exaggeration for imagination, and very ugliness, if only it be sufficiently startling, for originality.

There are two ways in which a retable may legitimately be treated; it may be considered as an enriched background, in front of which the cross and other ornaments of the altar stand, or the cross may be included in it, thereby making its connection with the altar more immediate and direct. In the first case the effect to be aimed at is that of quiet and uniform richness; no feature must be allowed, either in its form or its colour, to become individually conspicuous. The outline also should be simple. Indeed, whatever be the internal treatment of a retable, it is best that it should be contained within a rectangular margin; a single gable of any height generally overpowers the altar; a smaller gable rising alone in the middle breaks the unity, which in a retable it is most important to preserve; three or more gables or rising canopies usually become fussy; and the low gable or pediment form affected by the "vigorous" school is always ugly. Modern architects seem afraid of horizontal lines. If they will examine the best old work they will find it full of them.

If the altar-cross is to be included in the retable, the interest of the design, instead of as in the other case

being equal throughout the length, must culminate in the cross; for this ought to have a considerable, though not an overwhelming prominence. The first point then to be settled in such a retable is the size of the cross. It should not be too large. A not unnatural reaction from the Puritan bigotry, which would exclude the symbol of salvation altogether, has led to the exaggeration of the altar-cross in some modern churches, until it has almost eclipsed in æsthetic importance the altar itself. It is, of course, impossible to lay down any general rule as to the size of the cross. What in one case is quite right, may easily in another, with a different treatment, be too large or too small, the altar remaining the same. The cross should obviously belong to the altar, not the altar to the cross, and so long as this subordination is preserved, the cross will not be too large.

It is necessary here to consider whether the altar-cross shall or shall not be a crucifix, because, if not, figure-sculpture must altogether be excluded from the retable. For the retable being a single composition, of which the cross is the climax, the latter must at least equal in art value any of the rest. To make a quantity of imagery culminate in say an agglomeration of geometrical inlay, is to subordinate the nobler to the inferior—a ridiculous attempt, which is certain to result in failure. Sculpture must lead up to sculpture; mere geometrical forms must be supported by their like, or discord will be the inevitable result.

Whether or not figure-sculpture ought to be employed

in ecclesiastical architecture, is a question which may with perfect propriety be raised. In England it has been raised, and happily for the cause of art, which in its highest developments should always be the handmaid of religion, it has received a most general answer in the affirmative. Scarcely a church of any pretension is now built, into the decoration of which images in one form or another do not enter, and over the altars they are the most common. Now, the use of images being conceded, that of the crucifix, which is after all but an image, must be allowed at the same time; the objections to it can rest on grounds no more logical than does that strange "view" which allows the setting up of statues in honour of any saint in or out of the calendar, or indeed of any son or daughter of Eve, saint or sinner, *except* of her—the most honourable of all—who was chosen by her Creator to be His own mother.

In its teaching I am not aware that the crucifix over the altar is in any way superior to the simple cross, for it is an ideal, not a realistic representation; indeed, I doubt whether the latter ought ever to be attempted in sculpture. The figure on the altar-cross should, like that on the great rood, be suggestive of divinity and power, not of mortality and suffering. Dramatic representations of the Passion are perfectly right in their proper place, but, as I have just now shown, the retable is not the proper place for pictures. In richly-decorated churches, the crucifix is to be preferred, on the principle that the best of everything suitable should be lavished on the adornment of the altar. Now figure-sculpture is,

if properly used, perfectly suitable, and, being art in its highest form, is also one of the most appropriate things that can be so expended. But it is above all necessary that it should be good; bad ornament is intolerable. If good sculpture cannot be obtained, let no notion that a crucifix is "correct" persuade us to accept bad; the skill required to produce this, may be able to produce good work of a lower type, and of this let us avail ourselves; good work of a low type is respectable, bad of a high contemptible. The crucifix should not be crowded round with other figures, indeed, none should be allowed except those of our Lady and St John on either side; these also should be treated conventionally—as worshippers of their God, not as witnesses of the sufferings of their Master. The figure of the Magdalene is sometimes placed at the foot of the cross, but this should be avoided as being dramatic, and also because it takes off from the æsthetic importance of the crucifix. Other figures on the same scale as the central ones may be added, but, though ranging with them, they must stand apart in niches of their own, and need not have any historical connection either with one another, or with the central group. The whole treatment, however, both of these and of any secondary figures, which may be introduced in the tabernacle-work, or elsewhere, should be convergent towards the crucifix, or rather, perhaps, towards the centre of the altar. It is also advisable that all images should be raised on pedestals or otherwise, so as not to appear to stand directly upon the altar itself.

What has been said about the size of the altar-cross applies whether it have a figure or not, except that the presence of the figure is an additional reason why the cross should not be too large. For, although the attitude of the figure on the cross, and its position, raised, as it necessarily must be, some distance above the altar, take away the possibility of the dangers which may arise from the presence of a sitting or standing image in the same place, it is quite possible for the crucifix to become objectionably conspicuous.

It now remains for us to consider the treatment of the reredos when it extends beyond the altar-shelf and retable, making up what I have called the reredos proper. This it may do in length only, or in length and height. Where a reredos is against the east wall, it is far the best that it should not extend all across the sanctuary, but be little longer than the altar, the space between it and the side walls being covered with hangings of rich but sober colour. By this means the prominence of the reredos, and consequently of the altar, is much enhanced. But if the church stretches eastward behind the altar, the reredos must be carried all across, so as to form the eastern boundary of the sanctuary. This is a state of things which rarely exists in modern churches, but, as it is frequent in old ones, and in "restorations," is constantly mismanaged, it may be permitted to discuss it here. It is obvious that a small object like an altar, placed in the middle of a building, requires, if it is to become conspicuous, greater importance to be given to its accessories,

than if placed against an end wall. The better class of architects know this perfectly well, and, left to themselves, would act accordingly; but, unfortunately, one of the stock stupidities of modern times is belief in a *vista*. This same *vista* is the curse of our cathedrals and large churches. Half a century or so ago it caused dreadful destruction in screens and reredoses. Now a reredos of some sort or other has become "correct," indeed, a cathedral is scarcely considered to be properly cared for, unless one or two thousand pounds have been spent in alabaster trimmings about the altar. But if the architect rashly ventures to propose its treatment in the one only manner consistent with common sense, what a hubbub ensues! The Dean and Chapter protest, and, most likely, several members display their ignorance in print. The county is roused to arms in no time, "the *vista* is being destroyed." Subscriptions are withdrawn, and the architect, whatever be his professional reputation, is lectured on his own art by wiseacres, whose whole stock of knowledge is got up from "Parker's Glossary." The end is certain, of course the men with money have their way, the architect's good advice is rejected,[1] and he is compelled to begin again, and design what he knows is nothing but a costly nonentity, and might, in æsthetic effect, easily be surpassed by a good brick wall.

It is worth while to inquire what this *vista* is, about which such a fuss is made, and what it is worth. A *vista* is in itself simply extension in one direction only—

[1] And too often not paid for.

that of length. Now, a church is not a corridor to be passed along in order to reach a state apartment, it is itself the state apartment. Mere length may give impressiveness to an approach, each part of which is seen in succession; but a church, by which I mean that part of a building, whether it be the whole or not, arranged for public services, is intended for the simultaneous use of a large congregation of worshippers, not moving about, but each man in his place; it should be a vast hall possessing width and height as well as length. A very little reflection will show that, as scale only exists by comparison, the undue exaggeration of any one of these dimensions takes off from the effect of the other two; and that the least profitable of all, when carried to excess, is length. Height and width may, by subdivision and skilful arrangements of parts, be made to have their full value; but length overdone soon puts the side walls into such sharp perspective that all distinction of parts is lost, and the interior becomes a mere tunnel; the east end, by which the size of the building is really estimated, becomes greatly reduced, for its distance being unappreciated is not allowed for; and thus, the extra length, instead of adding to, actually takes off from the apparent size of the church. This is what we gain by a *vista*. Verily this worship of *vistas* can only have originated with those sapient *connoisseurs* who discovered evidence of the most exquisite art in the fact that St Peter's, at Rome, appears to be about a quarter of its real size.

I am quite aware that the last paragraph will be re-

garded by many as flat heresy, if not something worse, and that all the long churches in England, from Ely and St Alban's downwards, will be cited in testimony against me. To this I reply, firstly that the old builders neither were infallible, nor are exempt from criticism,[1] and that, if they did wrong, their example is no justification for us in doing the same; and, secondly, that the churches in question, if properly examined, prove their builders, in this as in most other matters, to have been actuated by that sound common sense and genuine art instinct which are so conspicuously absent in their modern would-be imitators. It is quite true that at the present time several of our cathedrals are reduced to *vistas*, but by the hand of the destroyer. That any mediæval architect ever planned a church of such ridiculous proportions, I altogether deny. The fact is, that the large cathedral and conventual churches are not like the parish churches, single apartments, but series of apartments, no one of which is as a rule of exaggerated length. If we examine, for instance, Winchester Cathedral, one of the least altered of them, we find first the nave, with its aisles, forming a magnificent and well-proportioned hall, at the east end of which rises a noble flight of steps, crowned formerly, not by the present mean erection, but by a lofty rood-screen, with, no doubt, two altars below, and with gorgeous imagery towering above it till it almost reached the vaulting, the whole forming the termination of the interior in that direction. Passing onward we enter the choir, a totally distinct apartment

[1] I am afraid this is another heresy.

fitted up solely for the monastic services,[1] and so entirely complete in itself that all the other parts of the building might be removed without affecting it beyond leaving certain holes which would have to be walled up to exclude the weather. At the east end of the choir our ancestors have shown their appreciation of the value of a *vista* by erecting a reredos all across, and of such height that it not only cuts off all view of what is beyond, but takes away all evidence of there being anything beyond. The aisles of the choir are merely passages of communication; and the transepts, which were in this instance divided into chapels, may be ignored just as, when speaking of a parish church as a single apartment, I ignored the various chapels which often cluster round it. Passing further eastward we find that the reredos was not set up because what was behind it was not worth showing. Quite otherwise, the Lady Chapel is in itself one of the most perfect little[2] churches

[1] Winchester Cathedral was a Benedictine monastery. It is probable that the fact of certain English cathedrals being served by regulars, gave rise to the custom of arranging the choirs, even of those where the foundation was secular, after the monastic fashion, to the exclusion of the laity from the services there performed—an encroachment on the part of the mediæval clergy from the effects of which we still suffer.

[2] I call it *little* by comparison with the great church to which it is attached. In actual dimensions it puts to shame the large majority of our modern churches. The nave and aisles together measure internally seventy-six feet by eighty-eight feet, the chancel alone fifty-four feet by twenty-eight feet. The whole is groined in stone, the walls are arcaded, the detail everywhere rich, much marble is employed, the floor is of figured tiles, even now considerable remains of painted glass exist in the windows, and many parts of the roof and walls are still rich with gold and colour, although a curious series of paintings, on the sanctuary walls, has unfortunately been whitewashed. The reredos of the high altar has per-

ever built. It consists of a nave with aisles, and a chancel with a small chapel on either side of it. The chancel is separated from the nave by a rood-screen with a loft, and is furnished with choir seats and desks arranged just as in a parish church. Except that it is entered from the aisles of the choir, this Lady Chapel is entirely independent of the main building. It was even provided with its own sacristy, and with a door into the churchyard.

Such is Winchester Cathedral, not one apartment in its length but three; such also was Salisbury before from a church it was converted into a *vista;* and such are or have been all our cathedral, monastic, and nearly all collegiate churches, except that in some cases there have been only two divisions, and others have had as many as four or five.

Whether this arrangement should be imitated, if we ever come to build large churches again, is not now the question. I have myself very little hesitation in saying that it should not. But we have now to inquire whether, if in an old or a new church there is space beyond the altar, any special treatment of the reredos should be adopted. I have already said that the altar requires greater importance to be given to its surroundings in such a position, than when against an end wall; in other

ished, but those in the two side chapels remain, and not only the chancel, but one chapel also, is fitted up with oak furniture of the richest description. The whole though built partly in the thirteenth, and partly in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, is in the most perfect harmony and good taste. I wish we could show a few modern churches fit to be compared with this appendage to a mediæval one.

words, the reredos must be of sufficient size to be conspicuous wherever it is visible. It must also extend all across the sanctuary. Whether it be treated as a single composition enclosing a comparatively small retable over the altar, or the retable itself be made the principal feature, and the spaces at the sides filled up with screen-walls or "wings," may be left to individual discretion; but this is certain, that if the high altar is to have anything like its proper importance, the reredos must be emphatically the eastern termination of the interior. A mere retable a few feet high, with open screens at the sides, is æsthetically valueless, and might as well not be there at all; we want something which shall forcibly attract the attention, and prevent its wandering away into the wilderness beyond. I do not say that all appearance of there being anything beyond should be taken away, as was sometimes done in the old churches; on the contrary, very pleasing effects are often produced by showing it. But such *peeps* should be small and quasi-accidental. Chance views of this sort give a building a much greater appearance of size, than if it were thrown open so that everything could be seen at a glance; but they must come of themselves; deliberately designed picturesqueness is certain to fail, or at best is mere stage scenery, only effective when seen from the right point. A building should be designed with a view to its particular uses, not with a view to architectural effects which have no connection with those uses; and of all misleading delusions a *vista* should be avoided like the plague. What would be said if Mr Ayrton's

surveyor were to propose to take away the canopy from the throne in the House of Lords, and remove the two walls behind it, so as to obtain a *vista* into the royal gallery? I really believe that the absurdity of this would be at once seen; and that the very men, who attend meetings, and make long speeches advocating precisely the same course in our cathedrals, would point out that, though the *vista* would certainly be obtained, the House of Lords as an apartment would be destroyed and the throne reduced to nothing more than an ordinary arm-chair; and that no open screen or railing placed behind it, would help it in any way.

The height of a screen-reredos may vary much. If the church is continued far eastward of the same height as the choir, the reredos should be very high, like the old examples at Winchester, St Alban's, Southwark, and Christ-Church (Hampshire). But if the buildings beyond it are low, all that is required is to shut out the view into them; and, except that it is carried all across the sanctuary, the reredos may be treated the same as if it stood against the east wall. When the altar, although not standing against the east wall, is but little in advance of the end of the main building, all beyond which is comparatively low,—that is, in such a case as at Westminster, where it stands just outside the apse, and the Lady Chapel beyond is almost entirely detached—then the altar is practically at the end of the interior, and the reredos need not be much higher than an ordinary retable. Indeed, if skilfully managed, a reredos of moderate height running across in front of an apse,

which may be seen over it, is one of the noblest terminations of a church which can be imagined. That at Westminster is a splendid example; it gives dignity even to the present naked altar. But if the altar were decently vested and furnished, and the present unmeaning picture replaced by a good retable, it would be difficult to surpass it anywhere. The reredos taken alone is scarcely high enough, but the chantry of Henry V., which it should be remembered was there before the reredos[1] was erected—by throwing the eastern arch of the apse into deep shadow, and cutting off the view beyond, more than compensates for its want of height, and at the same time makes up a gorgeously majestic whole, marvellous even now. What must it have been before the church was pillaged of the treasures with which this part of it more particularly abounded?

The old English screen-reredos had, I think, always a door in them on either side of the altar. These had a ritual use which no longer exists; they should therefore not be reproduced in modern work, unless, which sometimes may happen, there is a modern use for them.

Sometimes the circumstances of a church do not allow of an east window, nor indeed do I see that an architect is absolutely bound to use one, even if they do. If there is none, the treatment of the east wall will be similar to that of the more lofty kind of detached reredos. The smaller reredos or retable over the altar, may be merely a plain space of wall against which a

[1] It can be shown pretty conclusively that the reredos was erected in the reign of Edward IV.

movable dossel can be placed, or it may be designed as part of the great reredos. It must, however, always be complete in itself, and the larger system of imagery not be brought into it, as in that most unhappy example at Christ-Church, where a gigantic figure of Jesse sprawls at full length immediately on the top of the altar.

Above the retable the reredos, whether sculpture or painting form its adornment, should be treated as a single composition. I do not mean of course that it should be one huge picture, or a group of acrobatic angels, &c., posturing about in impossible attitudes. Either of these is ruination to an interior. But all the figures, though disposed in their proper niches and divisions, should bear a certain relationship to one another, and to a common centre. Histories are open to the same objection here as in the retable. But the scale of the figures is not similarly limited, and particularly the "majesty," which is so objectionable in the latter place, is perfectly right now; its distance above the altar takes away all danger of its being misunderstood. Indeed, nothing can be better than a figure of our Lord in majesty, forming the centre towards which numerous figures of the saints direct their attention; thus forming a representation of the worship in heaven, immediately above the altar, the centre of the worship on earth. With painting the adoration of the Lamb is a good subject, not in one panel only, but spread over many. At St Alban's and Winchester, the great reredoses have culminated in the crucifix. Somewhat greater freedom may be allowed in painting than in sculpture; but a

severe restraint must always be maintained, and all approach to vulgar realism rigorously excluded. Colossal figures are dangerous. I do not say that they ought never to be used, but they require extreme caution.

All detached reredoses, whatever be their height, are best finished with a horizontal cornice; projecting pinnacles and spires, whether they stand against light or shadow, are apt to become nothing more than rows of spikes.

I have spoken very generally of the reredos, and have now no intention of entering at length into the various forms which may be given to it, and materials of which it may be made. But there is one form, to which, as hitherto it has scarcely in this country received the notice it deserves, I will call attention. It is the high painted wooden reredos common in Germany. I would not have these copied, for I never saw one of them which was entirely satisfactory, but much may be learned from them. The doors are a feature which we need not reproduce, nor that unpleasant appearance which some of them have of standing upon the altar. But there is a gorgeous effect of colour about them which can never be obtained with marbles. Painted sculpture requires using with great caution, but reredoses of this sort may be made, with all the principal subjects painted in panels. And at the present time the painting at our command is better than the sculpture; there are in England several men capable of painting a reredos, but I really do not know one fit to carve one.

## *SECTION XVI.*

### OF ALTAR-CANOPIES.

THE altar-canopy is, as the usual name—*Baldacchino*—implies, an importation from Italy. There is reason to believe that something of the kind was used here during the Saxon times; but I am not aware of any evidence of its existence during the best periods of English art.[1] It has, however, recently made its appearance in one or two churches, and it is therefore our duty to inquire into its merits and capabilities, and to determine how far it is deserving of naturalisation amongst us.

Though not so historically, the altar-canopy may be considered æsthetically, as a development of the reredos. It is, if I may say so, an intensified form of reredos—a reredos raised a power higher. The purpose of both is the same, viz., the concentration of the interest of a large interior upon a small object—the altar. The one

[1] The recent controversy in the case of St Barnabas, Pimlico, has caused several old English erections to be cited as *Baldacchini*, which are not so really. As, for instance, that called the Sylvester shrine at Burford, Oxfordshire, which is really an enclosed and roofed chapel within the church. If it is a *Baldacchino*, then the monument of Abbot Wheathamsted at St Albans is a *Baldacchino*, and we have many *Baldacchini* in England. I need scarcely say that the attempt to attach a doctrinal meaning to altar-canopies is absurd, they have no more than pulpit or font-canopies.

attracts the eye by a special treatment of part of the wall of the main building; the other by a smaller building placed within the larger. The questions we have to consider then, are, Will our present churches, or any that we are likely to build, be better furnished by a canopy than by a reredos? and, supposing we decide in the affirmative, What are the points more especially to be attended to in designing the canopy?

In the first place, it should be noted that if a mean reredos is intolerable, much more so is a mean altar-canopy. It must be costly or it is nothing, and if it is costly its size will cause it to be very costly; the cost of a good reredos will go a very little way towards paying for an altar-canopy; and consequently it must not be introduced into the design of any church in which economy has to be studied. But, where this is not the case, it may be fairly discussed whether a canopy or a reredos is to be preferred. The former is, as I have just said, the stronger agent of the two; it—I suppose it to be in all respects well managed—brings about at once that which a reredos only effects as the last of a series of concentrations.

In a church of ordinary type, with nave and aisles, and a choir about as wide as the nave, the interest of the whole width is first concentrated in the central part or nave, and afterwards carried forward and intensified by the chancel, arch, screens, steps, &c., until it rests on the east wall. It then only remains to give the altar sufficient importance when compared with that wall, and it at once takes its due value in the interior. Now we

do not build, nor are we likely to build, chancels of greater width than, at the utmost, forty feet; and in them an altar of good size, say twelve to fourteen feet long, with well managed steps and reredos, is in no danger of losing its importance. I think therefore it may be said, that an altar-canopy is unnecessary in any church where there is a constructional choir, that is, where the concentration is brought about by the plan of the building. Indeed, in most cases it would, by creating confusion, rather obscure than dignify the altar. It is just possible that, in choirs of very great width, such as that at York, a canopy might be used with success, but even there, I think, a lofty reredos would be preferable.

But when instead of the ritual divisions of the church forming the basis of the plan, the whole building is treated as one vast hall, either absolutely undivided, or with the separated portions of such comparative unimportance as not to interfere with the general unity, we have not as in the other case the gradual leading on from the greater to the less, until the eye finally rests upon the altar. The altar is seen in comparison, not with an east end, or even with a chancel, but with the whole interior. There may or there may not be some arch or other architectural feature, which may assist it to some extent, but for the most part the altar must depend for its importance on itself and its own ornaments and surroundings. Much may be done by a judicious arrangement of the steps and floor levels; but this is not sufficient; the attention must be drawn from above downwards, as well as from below upwards to the

altar; a reredos is not enough; indeed, in a church of this sort an altar-canopy is almost a necessity.[1]

It ought particularly to be noted that not the size but the plan of a church should determine whether the canopy be used or not. I have said that York Minster, with its choir of fifty feet span, does not require it; but it may happen that a building forty feet in width does so. The hall type of the church should, however, never be used except on a large scale, unless we include in it small, aisleless, rectangular churches of ordinary width, which of course do not require altar-canopies.

In the designing of an altar canopy, as in that of a reredos, its relationship to the altar must always be kept in view. The result of a neglect of this is even more fatal to the effect of the interior in the former case than in the latter. I cannot give an illustration from English examples, but those who have been in the Cathedral of Speyer will remember, how mean and undignified the high altar appears, poor even when compared with the similarly placed and by no means entirely satisfactory altar at Mainz. This is due, to some extent, to the emptiness and want of furniture at Speyer, and also to the excessively bad arrangement of the floor-levels, but far more so to the very thing which was meant to give it dignity, to that ugly clumsy[2] little marble canopy

[1] This statement may seem inconsistent with that just made, that it is better to have no altar-canopy if a costly one cannot be afforded. My explanation is, that the hall-church itself, in which alone the canopy is required, should not be attempted except where the funds are practically unlimited. I feel sure that at least up to £60,000 the divided plan is the best.

[2] The clumsiness is in this case a consequence of the insane folly, which

which utterly crushes out the altar, and substitutes its ungraceful dome as the central feature of the church. It is not that a canopy there is in itself wrong. Quite otherwise; the arrangement of the building is such that a good altar-canopy is very desirable, but I do not hesitate to say that the removal of the present one would be an advantage, even if it were not replaced by a better.

The canopy must crown the altar, not conceal it. It must be lofty, and light, though substantial in appearance, not a heavy erection, with a little hole underneath to put the altar in. In material there is as great a choice as there is for a reredos, and, consequently, it is equally impossible to speak generally as to the architectural treatment. The best known mediæval altar-canopies are the Italian *baldacchini*, which are of marble, and consist of four pillars, joined by arches, and carrying a roof. This type is pretty sure to be copied in a modern church, should an altar-canopy be required; for the last idea likely to enter the head of an average architect of the present day is, that he should think a thing cut for himself. It is, however, not suitable to all materials; for instance, it is ridiculous, though now not uncommon, to give an arched shape to wood construction formed of straight-grained timber. If marble be used, the Italian

requires everything set up now, in the second half of the nineteenth century, in a church built in the twelfth to be an imitation of the style in use at that period. We have a great deal too much of this at home, but it seems to be carried to a still greater pitch on the continent. The requirement is about as rational as it would be to compel every man before entering an old church to don a hauberk or a leather jerkin.

form of canopy may be followed, but care should be taken to avoid the appearance of insecurity, or of what is as bad, dependence upon metal ties, which form no part of the construction as recognised in the design. It must also be large and high, and its eastern arch be closed by a reredos. And the light should be so arranged that the canopy shall not throw a dark shadow over the altar. This is particularly important by artificial light, which does not diffuse itself over an interior like daylight. It would no doubt be considered "correct" to stick a lot of candles on the top of a canopy, but they would do harm unless the altar below were itself sufficiently lighted up to neutralise their effect.

There are several reasons why wood seems to me to be a most suitable material for altar-canopies. We want stability, combined with lightness of appearance, richness, and importance, but at the same time subordination, or, if I may say so, subservience to the altar. I know nothing so well calculated to afford these results as wood, not in logs tortured into the forms of starved masonry, but with its *woodenness* recognised and respected, as we find it in the English joiners' work of the fifteenth century. It is at once light and substantial, and it is capable of the highest artistic treatment, both in sculpture and painting, and with it we are enabled to use a design of sufficient importance to attract the attention from the most distant parts of a building, whilst the minute division of parts prevents its clashing with the broad mass of the altar below. Such a canopy should, I think, not be carried on four equal posts at

the angles like the marble one, but should grow, as it were, from the reredos behind, supported at the sides by light screen-work, but entirely open in front. Indeed, I cannot point to a better executed model than the canopy over the throne in the House of Lords, which I have already used as an illustration when speaking of the reredos.

Cast metal is a material which also may be used for altar-canopies, either alone or in combination with marble. If it be used alone, the general form may be such as I have just recommended for wood; if in combination, the marble will probably regulate the design. A good canopy cannot be made of wrought metal; it is an exceedingly "correct" material, owing to the ease with which it can be twisted into those extraordinary shapes which the fashion of the day insists upon believing to be "mediæval," and consequently we often see it doing duty for which it is absurdly unfitted. For a grille in which lightness, strength, and unobtrusiveness are required, nothing can be better; but for a broad, *monumental* treatment, it is by its nature unsuitable, and the modern attempts to use it in this manner have in consequence always proved failures.

It is unnecessary to discuss the iconography of the altar-canopy, as it would be but to repeat what was said concerning the reredos.

## *SECTION XVII.*

### OF THE CREDENCE AND PISCINA.

I INCLUDE these in one section, because, properly speaking, the latter is but an appendage of the former. The credence is a sort of side table, upon which certain vessels and other things required during the celebration of the Holy Eucharist are placed and made ready, so as to be conveniently near to the altar when wanted. The piscina is a sink or drain, through which the water used in several ablutions is poured away.

Of all the surroundings of the altar the credence is that of the most practical importance. It is therefore particularly unfortunate that in ninety-nine out of a hundred modern churches it is either omitted or badly placed. There is no point upon which modern church-builders are more obstinately "correct" than in placing the credence on the north side of the sanctuary, a position not only exceedingly inconvenient, but what its advocates will probably think more serious—altogether opposed to every authority and "mediæval precedent." The mistake is so general that I hope I may be pardoned for departing for a short time from my rule of excluding purely archæological considerations from my argument, in order to show that the usage of the old builders was

in this matter also in accordance with good sound common sense.

In seeking for information as to what was the ancient practice, we naturally look first to the old churches which still remain to us; and there on the south side of every altar, almost without exception, we find a single or double niche, generally containing a drain (sometimes two), and often a shelf or bracket. Sometimes this niche is so small as to be entirely taken up by the drain, but often it is amply large enough to hold all that is required to be placed on the credence. Not unfrequently, but by no means always, a recess is also seen on the north side of altars. This rarely takes the niche form, and will I think, if examined, always be found to have been provided with doors. In some cases the architectural treatment and decoration prove beyond doubt that it was intended for the reception of the blessed sacrament, but often there is nothing to indicate this, and sometimes it appears to be larger than would be provided for that purpose; and again its occasional occurrence at minor altars argues some less important use. Other recesses and ledges, which might be used as credences, are occasionally found near altars, but the two—the niche with the drain on the south, and the locker on the north—are of such constant occurrence, that if the credence was a fixture forming part of the fabric of the church it must have been one of them. Each has been claimed for it.

The old English service books, so far as I have observed—but I must confess that my knowledge of them

is only slight—give no direct information about the position of the credence. The word *credentia* does not occur; indeed, this name is of comparatively modern introduction, and of secular origin. But we have abundant evidence of the existence of the thing, and how it was used in St Osmund's Consuetudinary, chap. xciii. . . . "*Post introitum vero misse, unus ceroferariorum panem et vinum et aquam in pixide et phiolis solempniter ad locum, ubi panis, vinum et aqua ad eucharistie ministrationem deponuntur, deferat. Reliquus vero cerophorarius pelves cum aqua et manutergio.*" And again, "*Interim etiam veniant duo cerophorarii obviam acolito ad ostium presbyterii cum veneratione ipsum calicem ad locum predicte administrationis deferente offertorio et corporalibus ipsi calici superpositis. . . . Calice itaque in loco debito reposito, corporalia ipse acolitus super altare solempniter deponat. . . . Lecta Epistola, subdiaconus panem et vinum, post manuum ablutionem, ad eucharistie ministrationem in loco ipsius administrationis preparet ministerio acoliti.*"

We learn from these passages that the objects which were placed in the *locus administrationis*—evidently what we now call the credence—were not kept there permanently, but brought in during the time of the service, which leads to the conclusion that the locker on the north side of the presbytery is not the place referred to, for there would be no use for the doors with which we always find it to have been provided. But we can here find no certain information as to either the form or the position of the old credence. Fortunately, however,

there is in the Roman missal a rubric which, coupled with the evidence of our own ancient churches, seems to set the matter entirely at rest; this runs, "*A parte epistolæ paretur cereus ad elevationem sacramenti accendendus, parva campanula, ampullæ vitreæ vini et aquæ, cum pelvicula et manutergio mundo in fenestella seu in parva mensa, ad hæc præparata.*[1] Nothing could better describe what we find here in our old English churches than this *fenestella a parte epistolæ.* There can be no doubt that, where it was large enough, the niche at the south side of the sanctuary was the *locus administrationis*, and, where it was too small for this purpose, it accommodated the water drain, and probably the ewer basin and napkins, the *parva mensa* being used for the chalice and crewets, as is now directed in the Roman rubric. A few examples may be found of the reverse arrangement, where the niche was used for the credence and the drains provided for elsewhere.[2]

To have proved that the credence anciently stood on the south side of the altar is, of course, no argument in favour of so placing it now, if it can be shown that the northern position is more convenient. But this I believe to be impossible. The old builders did not trouble themselves about "correctness," and, when we find them

[1] *Rubricæ generales*, xx.

[2] A curious instance of this occurs in the chancel of Reepham Church, Norfolk. A shallow niche seventeen inches wide is found in the usual place, it has a shelf, above which it is divided by a mullion, but there is no drain. This is provided for by a small pillar rising from the bench of the *sedilia*, the cap of which is dished out to form a shallow bowl. The date appears to be about 1350.

constantly adhering to one arrangement, we may be pretty sure that that was the most convenient, and, in this matter, what was convenient then must be so now. The reasons for the southern position are these. Everything which the celebrant requires when at the altar is brought from the credence, and is handed to him by the gospeller or clerk, as the case may be. Now the celebrant always turns to the south to receive things. This he does for no mystical reason, but simply because by so doing he can, when standing in front of the altar, make use of his right hand, whereas by turning north he would be compelled to use his left. Of this any one may at once convince himself by standing in front of a high table, and turning to the one hand and to the other. Such being the case, it is obvious that if the credence is on the north side a server will have twice to cross the sanctuary in front of the altar each time when anything is wanted, thus producing a great deal of unmeaning, unnecessary, and distracting walking about, besides occasionally putting the server into very difficult situations, all of which may be avoided by placing the credence in its ancient position.

In spite of its being not only inconvenient in itself, but contrary both to ancient English precedent and to the modern usage of the rest of the Western Church, the northern position of the credence is insisted upon by clergy as well as architects, with scarcely an exception. New churches, even those specially built for elaborate services, almost invariably have it so placed, and cases may even be found where "correct" credences have been

set up on the north sides of old churches, where the original ones, perfectly good and usable, still remain on the south. Why this error, which is far from being now pointed out for the first time, should be so pertinaciously adhered to, I cannot understand. It is quite modern,[1] and I know of no argument in its favour—but that one scarcely expects of a "correct arrangement." It may possibly have originated from the fact that the *prothesis* of the Eastern Church is north of the altar; this, however, is used in a very different manner from our credence.

Having settled that the credence must be on the south side of the sanctuary, it remains to determine its exact position on that side, and also its form. But before discussing these, it will be well to turn our attention to the drain. We find this spoken of by old writers under a variety of names,[2] but it will avoid confusion if we for the future confine ourselves to the one—*piscina*—which is now generally used, for a multitude of names for the same thing is an evil, which, however "mediæval," it is highly desirable to get rid of. The piscina is not unfrequently provided in the sanctuaries of modern churches,

[1] The curious seventeenth-century plan of Bishop Andrewes's chapel, a copy of which is given in the *Hierurgia Anglicana*, shows the credence as a small, nearly square table at the south-east corner of the sanctuary. On it are the canister for wafers, the *tonne* answering to the wine crewet, and the ewer basin and napkin. The *tricanale*, or water-crewet is strangely placed on the altar; but perhaps this is a mistake.

[2] Besides *piscina*, we find it called *sacrarium*, *lavacrum*, *lavatorium*, and even *fons*, the confusion is made worse confounded by each one of these words having one, two, or perhaps as many as half-a-dozen other meanings. This interchange of words is common amongst mediæval writers, and is constantly leading to the discovery of mare's nests by controversial antiquaries.

but it is rarely used, or at least rarely used in the manner which caused its presence in mediæval churches. For the ceremony of washing the hands of the celebrant before commencement of the canon is now most commonly omitted, and the final ablution in the chalice is not poured away but drunk. Indeed, the only use which is now generally made of the piscina, is to pour into it the water which has been used for washing the sacred vessels, altar-linen, &c., this washing taking place not in the sanctuary but in the sacristy. It is certainly right that a special drain should be provided for this purpose, but to place it in the sanctuary is as absurd as it would be to place a scullery sink in a dining-room. Let it be in the sacristy where it is wanted, and indeed no sacristy should be without it. But if this is to be its only use, let us no longer place a *piscina* in the sanctuary; for to continue to provide a now useless feature, simply because we find it in churches built in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when it had a use, is silly, though it may be "correct." If, however, the washing of the hands before the canon is to be continued, or I should rather say revived,[1] amongst us, the *piscina* in the sanctuary must also be retained. The question then rests with the clergy, not with architects, who have professionally nothing to do with the ritual of the church; but, this being determined, it is their duty to plan the church accordingly. I do not mean that each church is to be specially planned to suit the fancies of its individual

[1] Its disuse is comparatively recent, as may be seen by the provision of a basin, ewer, and napkin on the credence in Bishop Andrewes's chapel.

incumbent—that would sometimes lead to curious results—but that the ordering of the services having been settled by those competent to do so, the architect's part is to so plan and arrange the building as best to suit that ordering.

Unfortunately, there is at the present time no sufficient authority to which architects may look for guidance, and consequently, when practice varies, they are sometimes compelled to follow their own discretion. Hitherto, in my discussion of the church and its arrangements, no question has arisen which cannot be settled either by plain common sense, or by the general usage of the English Church, whether actually laid down in the Book of Common Prayer, or logically deduced from it. There are a few points, however, which cannot be so determined, and of these that now under consideration is one. I am inclined to think that the *piscina* should be provided for the following reasons: The general and rapid tendency in the English Church at the present time is towards the reintroduction of such ceremonial as has the sanction of antiquity and general usage, but which, though not forbidden on the translation of the services, has from neglect been allowed to fall into disuse. And I think that the ablutions for which the *piscina* was formerly provided cannot fail to share in this restoration, for although they are now used in comparatively few English churches, they were general here formerly, as they continue to be on the continent at the present day. And although, as I have just said, the architect is in these matters not a leader but a follower, it behoves him not

to lag behind. He must keep up with the foremost, or in a few years his churches will become as obsolete and unfit for practical use as the Peel churches are at the present time. No harm can come from having a thing before it is wanted, if only it is likely to be wanted some day, and is not in the way in the meantime. And a *piscina* can be contrived in the wall of a church at a trifling cost when it is being erected, but is an awkward thing to have to insert afterwards. It seems, therefore, best to provide it even in churches where for the present it is not likely to be used.

Before we can determine the best form for the piscina, we must ascertain how it ought to be used. I should scarcely have thought this inquiry necessary, but that I find a strange opinion prevalent that the piscina is a wash-hand-basin. I have even seen in published directions, professedly taken from the old service books, an order for the hands to be washed "*in the piscina*." Surely, if this had been its use, our practical ancestors would not have made its average something less than two inches deep in the middle, and would certainly have provided it with a plug, if not also with a lead lining and a chain, instead of sometimes so contriving it, that a moveable plug would be impossible. The ablutions were not made *in* the piscina; indeed, except when the epistoler washed his hands previously to preparing the elements at the credence, at which time he was conveniently near to the piscina, I doubt whether they were often even made *at* it. The washing of the celebrant's hands before the canon was done, *ad dextram cornu*

*altaris*—at the south corner of the altar—and the *pelves cum aqua et mauutergio* of the English, like the *pelvicula cum manutergio mundo* of the Roman directions quoted above, were used for this purpose, the water being poured over the hands of the celebrant and received in the basin, which was then taken to the piscina and emptied. It is probable that the last washing, now superseded by the rinsing of the fingers over the chalice, was most usually done at the same place and in the same manner, but in some churches, both in England and France, the priest does seem to have gone to the piscina for this,[1] in which case no doubt the basin was not used, but the hands being held over the *piscina*, the water was received directly by it. The *piscina* then must be considered as a sink not as a bowl. Sometimes we find two or even three piscinæ near ancient altars, but one is all that is now wanted, so that we need not here stop to inquire what was the former use of the others.

A small moveable wooden table will serve all the purposes of a credence, and when it has to be added to an existing building, this is perhaps the best; but when a new church is being erected, I think that the credence should be part of the fabric. It may take the form either of a recess in the wall, with or without a shelf, or

[1] "*Eat ad sacrarium et lavet manus suas*," says the rubric of the Hereford missal. The Sarum in the corresponding place has simply, "*Deinde lavet manus.*" The Bangor rubric is in distinct opposition to the Hereford, "*Eat sacerdos ad dextrum cornu Altaris, et abluat manus.*" I quote from Mr Maskell's reprint in his "Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England."

of a projecting bracket, each of which has advantages. The bracket is somewhat the more accessible, but, on the other hand, the recess takes up the least space, and for this reason is to be preferred in narrow sanctuaries; and, indeed, in all but very large churches, bracket-credences are liable to become too prominent, and consequently to detract somewhat from the importance of the altar.

Until the clergy are agreed as to what should be placed on the credence, it is impossible to determine definitely what should be its size. As I understand the rubrics, it is required to hold only the chalice and paten, the crewets and altar-breads, and the basin, ewer, and napkin; but I find that some moderns, with what object, practical or ritual, I should like to be told, place upon it the service-book with its desk, with a variety of other things, amongst them the biretta, the use of which, when approaching the altar, is a modernism imported from France, where it only dates from the seventeenth century. The credence also seems a more fitting place for the books of the Gospels and Epistles than the floor, where we not unfrequently see them now. If all these things are to be accommodated, it must be of considerable size, and as it is better that it should be too large than too small, I think we may fix as the minimum length two feet if there be a shelf, and three if there be not; twelve or fourteen inches will be a convenient width. The height from the ground should not be too great for it to be used with ease by boys, nor too small for men; perhaps the best form for the credence of the high

altar is a recess with a shelf, the upper level four feet from the ground, the lower three, the former being used only for high services. The best place for the credence is in the south wall of the sanctuary, towards the east end; it should not, however, if it can be avoided, be too much in the corner, but in broad, shallow sanctuaries it may sometimes be placed with advantage in the east wall. When used, the credence should be covered with a cloth, so that the vessels, &c., may not stand directly upon the stone. The shelf may be of wood.

The same arguments which fix the south side of the altar as the proper place for the credence, also apply to the piscina, with the additional one that the piscina is generally used in connection with the credence, and therefore should not stand far from it. The piscina being required not to hold, but simply to carry off the liquid which may be poured into it, a shallow, perforated basin in any easily-reached situation will serve the purpose, and consequently it may, according to circumstances, assume an almost infinite variety of forms. It may either be contained in the niche forming the credence—in which case it should not be sunk in the slab forming the credence proper, as is common in old examples, but bracketed out from the back, or recessed in the side, so as to avoid wetting the cloth of the credence when the piscina is used—or it may be independent, either projecting from the wall, or recessed in a small niche of its own, and placed east or west of, or even below the credence, but close to it. The drain of the *piscina* should end in a dry well like that of the font.

At a side altar, where only a small credence is required, the common mediæval form of a niche with a shelf will be found convenient, the lower part containing the piscina, and also holding the ewer and basin, and the crewets, &c., being placed on the shelf, which should not be more than three feet six inches from the floor.

## *SECTION XVIII.*

### OF THE SEDILIA.

THE name *sedilia* is by moderns confined to the particular seats set apart in the sanctuary for the use of the officiating clergy. The need of such seats is shown by the provision of what were called *altar-chairs*, even at the period when English ritual was at its lowest. Their original purpose was to afford a place where the clergy, and particularly the fasting celebrant, might rest during the portions of the service in which they were not themselves engaged. At the present time—at least, in those churches where there is proper accommodation for the clergy in the choir—the *sedilia* are only used during the sermon, but, anciently, the clergy retired to them whilst the choir sang several parts of the service, and whenever they were not engaged at the altar. If the former is to continue to be their sole use, it would seem reasonable that they should be placed with regard to the pulpit rather than to the altar, so that their occupants might conveniently listen to the sermon, instead of being placed in a position, which is usually one of the worst for hearing from in the church. But if the ancient custom is to be revived—and, at least so far as regards the creed, there seems to be every reason why it should be—our object will be to provide

a place as near as possible to the altar, to which the celebrant and his ministers may retire conveniently and without fuss at the proper times.

The *sedilia* must be placed against one of the walls of the sanctuary, so as to interfere with the free passage as little as possible. The east wall, the usual position thirty years ago, is bad, as the clergy seated there, facing west, become unduly conspicuous, and, having no connection with the altar, withdraw the attention from it; and also, they must either be all crowded together on one side, or be separated, neither of which is convenient, and in the latter case there is with three—the usual number—the additional difficulty of determining how the separation shall be managed and the seats assigned. The ancient *sedilia* are, with few, if any exceptions, on the south side of the sanctuary. Doubtless some people can find deep mystical meaning in this arrangement, but I believe the origin of it is simply that the celebrant, when not standing "in the midst of the altar," stood at the south side, never on the north, and, consequently, it was convenient that his seat should also be on the south side. There now seems to be little practical difference between the north side and the south; in favour of the latter, it may indeed be said that, being on the contrary side to the pulpit when in its usual place, it is therefore somewhat the better position for hearing. But, in order that the same ritual may be observed in different churches, it is important that the arrangements of the sanctuaries shall be, as much as may be, uniform, consequently, the southern position, being at least as convenient

as the other, should be assigned to the *sedilia* in modern churches, as we find it in old ones.

The normal number of *sedilia* is three—viz., one each for the celebrant, gospeller and epistoler. In old churches the number varies from one to five, although three is much the commonest; and I think it will be best always to provide this number now; for, whatever may formerly have been the purpose of the additional one or two, we have now no use for them; and, although in perhaps the majority of churches the celebrant is usually attended only by a lay clerk, there are very few in which occasionally, at dedication festivals and such times, there may not be a gospeller and epistoler, for whose accommodation it is as well that provision be made. In chapels sometimes a single *sedile* may be convenient, but there seems to be no advantage in two, for one of them will be useless when the priest is unattended, and an additional seat will be required if there be a high celebration —unless indeed the *sedilia* be only used during the sermon, and one of the officiating clergy also preach.

Whether the seats be all on one level, or rise one above the other towards the east, will depend on the floor levels of the sanctuary, in arranging which the approach to the *sedilia* should always be considered. Generally it will be found most convenient to place them on the highest of the steps going all across the sanctuary. If there is not room, the westernmost may be dropped a step, but, as it is now usual for the celebrant to occupy the middle seat, we ought to avoid making that lower than the eastern one. In a wide sanctuary there is no

harm in the *sedilia* having a special platform, but, if so, it should not be raised above that on which the altar-pace stands, and care must be taken in arranging the steps round it, to make the approach easy from all sides, and avoid an awkward drop at the west end.

The *sedilia* may take a great variety of forms. The most "correct" is that of three arched recesses in the wall of the sanctuary. This has certain advantages; it often looks very well, and, being part of the fabric, it is permanent, and also, being in the thickness of the wall, it does not reduce the floor space. Another good form for large churches is a single recess with a seat large enough to hold three. In cheap churches, the sill of a window may be brought down so as to make a bench. In all these forms the stone bench should have a wooden seat placed on the top of it, and the back and sides should be hung with curtains, so that the vestments may not be injured by rubbing against the masonry, and for a similar reason, in the divided *sedilia* the shafts, *and also the bases*,[1] should be made of polished marble.

Where the wall is too thin to allow of the *sedilia* being recessed in it, they may take the form of a settle about seven feet long, divided by elbows into three compartments. These should not be copied from old stalls, which were arranged as much for standing in as for sitting. I have seen modern *sedilia* with misericords!

[1] The shafts are now generally made of marble, the bases never, except when the whole sanctuary is lined with it. They are really the more important, for the vestments are brought more roughly into contact with them.

When *sedilia* have to be added to an existing building, or where the chancel has a south aisle its full length, this form will also be convenient; in the latter case they may have canopies forming part of the screen-work of the sanctuary. But it is impossible to lay down strict rules as to the form of the *sedilia*, which must be regulated by the character of the building, and the funds at command. One of the best forms is a wooden settle, such as I have just described, placed in a recess large enough to receive it in the south wall of the sanctuary; this combines the advantages of the wood and stone *sedilia*.

A practice has lately been introduced amongst us of placing seats for lay servers in the sanctuary. We find none such in the old churches, because formerly the servers never sat in the sanctuary, the easternmost places in the choir being reserved for their use. But, if the modern usage is to continue, we ought to provide something better than the rush-bottomed chairs now often used. The best thing seems to be a simple bench of wood or stone against the north wall. It should be about eight feet long, as it has to accommodate four, and if of stone, must, of course, have something laid on the top.

## *SECTION XIX.*

### OF MINOR ALTARS AND SIDE CHAPELS.

I HAVE already said that all but very small churches should be provided with second altars. These may either stand in a chapel capable of accommodating the worshippers at them, or they may be so placed that the worshippers may occupy a portion of the body of the church. Of these the former is as a rule the better, but sometimes the other will be found convenient, particularly when rearranging an old building, in which the chancel has no aisles. In such a case the altar may be placed at the east end of one of the nave aisles, the worshippers making use of the pews in the neighbourhood. An altar so placed has, however, the objection of being liable to become too conspicuous, and to enter into a kind of competition with the high altar. It will also sometimes be convenient for both altars to be used at the same time, and all who have witnessed it—as may not unfrequently be done in continental churches—know how distracting it is to worshippers at one altar to have a service going on within their sight at another. It is, therefore, desirable that, where it can conveniently be managed, the minor altar should be so placed as not to be visible from the body of the church.

An altar standing in a chapel should bear exactly the

same relation to its chapel as the high altar does to the whole church; that is, it must be the centre both of the design and the arrangement, saving only that nothing must be done to the injury of the supremacy of the high altar. Where the position of the chapel is such as not to form part of the main plan, its altar and surrounding ornaments may be developed to any desired extent in the same manner as in the chancel; but where, as will often be the case, part of the chapel is intended to be used also by worshippers at the high altar, the second altar should not be too conspicuously treated. In the latter case, the furniture of the people's portion of the chapel should not be heavy or fixed, but easily movable, so that it may be arranged with regard to either altar, according as may be required.

The internal arrangement of a chapel is a comparatively simple matter, because it is intended to be used for celebrations alone, and, as a rule, only for those when there is no sermon, and when the priest is attended by a clerk only, there being no gospeller, epistoler, or choir. It may, therefore, be considered as divided into two parts, the place of the people and the place of the altar, corresponding to the nave and sanctuary of the church. The first of these divisions may, as I have said, also form part of the main plan; the sanctuary should never do so, and should always be enclosed by a close rail with gates, if the whole chapel be not completely screened.

As the services performed in the chapel contain neither sermons nor long lessons, we need not fill it with pews for the congregation to sit in. Some few people

require seats, and for these I would provide benches against the walls on the north, south, and west, with low desks, something after the manner of a chancel with a single row of choir seats. The majority of the worshippers need only kneeling accommodation, which may be supplied in the area of the chapel, in the form of either kneeling chairs or simple stools. Sometimes, in continental churches, one sees long boards laid on the floor, with stools fixed to them, one behind another at equal intervals. I think these might, with advantage, be introduced amongst us. They are inexpensive, easy to move and to stow away when not wanted, they do not shift about and make a noise when in use, and, what is not an unimportant matter, they can easily be cleaned.

The sanctuary of a side chapel will in most respects be similar to that of a small chancel, except that it will be shorter—seven or eight feet from the front of the altar to the rail is often enough. *Sedilia* are not required. The altar may be as little as five feet long, and may or may not be provided with a reredos. There should not be many steps, for there is no need that the altar should be visible from a distance; generally, one at the rail and one within it will be enough. I think that, whether required as a fence or not, the altar-rail should always be provided in side chapels, for in them communions will be commonly made, and it will be most required as a support; and it is not an inconvenient obstruction as it often is at the high altar, for there is here no necessity for passing in and out from the sanctuary during the service.

In large churches, where the chapel is remote from the sacristy, it would be well to provide it with a special vestry. This need but be very small, and may be in any position in or near the chapel where room can be spared for it.

## *SECTION XX.*

### OF CONFESSIONALS.

THAT confessionals were not provided in churches built twenty years ago, is not to be wondered at, nor even that now they should not be found everywhere; but that, with scarcely an exception, they should be omitted in buildings, where from the very first it is known they will be wanted, and that the clergy should be driven to improvise them for themselves, is discreditable to the architectural profession. It may be said that prejudice on the part of the architects has prevented them from providing their churches with confessionals, but, if one may judge by what we see they do put there, we can scarcely believe this to be always the case. Moreover, it is not an architect's business to dispute points in church doctrine or discipline, but, having ascertained the requirements of his clients, to provide suitable accommodation for them. That confessionals are now wanted in many churches cannot be denied, I therefore hold that I should be to blame, if I did not include them in the present discussion. Indeed, I cannot help thinking that the true explanation of their omission by modern architects, is to be found in the fact that we have no mediæval examples.[1]

[1] Or, at least, if we have, they are so doubtful as to have served no

In the Middle Ages the confessor sat on a chair and the penitent knelt on the floor at his side. That this simple arrangement is not suited to present circumstances, is proved by the existence of the makeshifts to which I have just alluded. These are not the products of "correctness," which somewhat unaccountably has put its *veto* upon the modern continental confessional box, but are contrivances, generally clumsy and always ugly, to meet what are held to be the necessities of the case. It is for architects to take up the hints given by these, and, selecting what seems most suitable, form a model which shall be at once convenient and sightly.

What we have to provide is a place somewhat retired, but still public, and so arranged and fitted up as to remove, as far as possible, all causes of distraction either to the confessor or the penitent. The chair and the kneeling place still form as in the Middle Ages the essence of the confessional, and any arrangements which we may make can only be developments from these. The additional requirements of modern confessors appear to be, that there shall be a screen with a perforated panel between them,[1] and the penitents, and that the view of

purpose except that of providing matter for archæological disputation. It *is*, perhaps, a little surprising that hitherto no very "correct" man has banished the penitents into the churchyard, and compelled them to confess through a "Lychnoscope," as it is still "correctly" called, although the opinion which caused the invention of that ugly word has, I believe, been abandoned.

[1] From that curious and interesting little book, Myre's "Instructions for Parish Priests," edited by Mr Edward Peacock for the early English text society, it appears that in the fifteenth century the confessor's hood was made to serve for this purpose, see line 883. In some old representations

what is going on outside shall be cut off from both of them. It is not necessary that they themselves should be invisible to those without; rather the contrary is to be desired, at least of the penitent, whereby both concealment is avoided and privacy is secured; for the fact of a confessional being seen to be occupied, will serve better than anything else to warn men not to approach too near to it. It is obvious, that, whilst still observing these requirements, the varieties of form which may be given to confessionals are almost endless. It is, therefore, impossible to do more than discuss very generally certain arrangements, the detailed working out of which must be specially regulated by the conditions and circumstances of each individual case.

A confessional may either be a part of the fabric of the building, which in this, as in most other matters, is generally the best, or it may be a piece of furniture; in this latter shape it is easiest to add it to an existing church, and also, what may sometimes be a convenience, it can be made moveable. The most convenient form may be described as two closets separated by a thin wall or screen, on one side of which is a chair for the confessor, and on the other a kneeling place for the penitent, the only communication being through a small grated window or a perforated panel conveniently placed in the partition. Of these two closets the outer, or that for the penitent, must always be directly accessible from the body of the church, from

of the sacrament of penance, I have seen a bench placed between the confessor and the penitent. There is an example on the font at Sall, near Reepham in Norfolk.

which I think it is best, that it should be separated only by screen-work, sufficiently open to allow it to be seen whether there is any one in the confessional or not, but arranged so as to prevent the attention of the occupant from being distracted by what is going on outside. This may be managed by means of a curtain, but it is better that it should be provided for in the design. A door is not needed at the entrance, but in some situations it will be well to provide a light gate, which may be locked when the confessional is not being used. The priest's closet may be approached either from the body of the church, in which case its entrance will be near the other, or from the sacristy or some other private part of the building. If the confessional be an independent piece of furniture, the former is alone possible; but, where it forms part of the fabric, the latter will often be found convenient. Both closets ought, I think, to be moderately light—which they are not generally in the continental examples—in order that the penitent, if so minded, may refer to notes, and the priest fill up his spare time with reading. For, in many churches, it is the custom for the clergy to be ready in the church, to hear confessions during certain fixed hours, and it may happen that no penitents present themselves. The priest ought not to be compelled to sit shut up doing nothing in a dark closet the whole time; but, if necessary, a special window should be provided to light it.

In selecting a position for a confessional, care must be taken that it is in the part of the church usually open to the public; that it is not conspicuous; that it does not

take up space which ought properly to belong to the congregation, or in any way interfere with the public services; and that it is not near to an entrance, or in any place by which it is necessary to pass, in order to get from one part of the building to another. Where it is a piece of furniture, the best place will generally be in an aisle of the chancel, or in a side chapel, if there is one. If it be placed in the nave, or one of its aisles, it will become too conspicuous, besides encroaching upon the congregation's part of the church. If, however, it be a part of the fabric, it may be placed so as to be external to the main building; then, between two buttresses of the aisle is a very good place for it, if there is, as there always should be, a wide passage against the outer wall, by which it may be approached. It may also be placed between the church and the sacristy, one entrance opening into each; indeed, as I have just said, the possible arrangements are almost endless.

In continental churches, as a rule, confessionals are made with a kneeling place on each side. This, which is probably nothing more than a sacrifice to symmetry, is practically absurd; for no priest can hear two confessions at once; it is also objectionable, for, if we suppose both to be occupied, it is not impossible that what is said in one may be heard in the other, notwithstanding the curtain or sliding panel which may be placed between. In other respects the older continental confessionals are very good models to follow; the more modern ones are so bedoored and beshuttered as to be more like packing cases for goods, than places meant for human occupation.

The number of confessionals to be provided must be regulated by the size of the church, or, more strictly speaking, by the number of clergy attached to it. For, at certain seasons all may require them at the same time, besides which, it is desirable that each confessor should have a confessional known to be appropriated to his sole use.

## *SECTION XXI.*

### OF THE SACRISTY AND VESTRY.

I HAVE already spoken of the positions of these, it now remains to discuss their furniture. Architects nearly always leave vestries perfectly empty, which is, perhaps, partly to be accounted for by the absence of mediæval precedents—for, with the exception of a few stone lockers without doors, and some dozen or so of clumsy cope chests, we have no old fittings left—but it is chiefly owing to the miserable parsimony which so often rules our modern church building. When an architect is called upon to build a church, for about half the sum which would be spent upon a stable covering the same area, we may excuse him for leaving the vestry small and empty; indeed, our admiration should rather be excited, that he is able to provide even the barest furniture for the church itself.

The vestries thus left unfurnished by the architect cannot be said to be, as a rule, satisfactorily completed by those who come after him. In the majority of English churches their furniture consists of little more than two hat-pegs, a rickety table, a dry inkstand, and an old almanack; and even the highest effort seems only to result in a sort of combination between a musty store-room and a neglected back-parlour. The fact that the

vestry is a part, and not an unimportant part of a church, is entirely overlooked. "Out of sight, out of mind," seems to be the motto. As the congregation cannot see into it, it matters not how bare, how shabby, or even how dirty it may be.

There should, as I have said, always be two vestries, one for the choir, and one for the clergy. The former requires little furniture, all that is needed is proper accommodation for the surplices and cassocks of the choir. A row of hooks, even with a curtain in front, is too much exposed to dust; it is best to provide shallow closets against the walls with hooks inside them. The doors should fit well, and be hung on hinges, in widths of from two feet to two feet six inches; sliding doors, although they take up less room when open, are not to be recommended, as they are liable to stick, and they only allow a portion of the closet to be open at a time. Cassocks and surplices should be hung separately; for if so the latter are found to keep clean for a much longer time. There should be accommodation for at least two sets of surplices; and, when practicable, each set should have its own closets. These closets should be real, complete pieces of furniture with tops, backs, and ends; not mere screens with doors in them, placed a short distance from a wall in which there is a row of hooks.

Besides the surplice-closets, and a cupboard with shelves for music-books, there need be no other furniture in the choir vestry. Chairs and tables are of no use, and only inconveniently take up room; it is, therefore,

best to be without them, except that in some cases it would be well to provide a small table at which books might be signed, and suchlike business transacted, so as to avoid the necessity of strangers entering the sacristy.

The requirements of the sacristy are more complicated, and are more or less affected by the character of the services held in the church. In what I now have to say, it will be convenient to suppose myself speaking of a good-sized church, in which the accessories of worship are brought to their highest development; the sacristies of other churches will differ from what is described, only by the omission of this or that provision, which, in individual cases, may be unnecessary. It will also be convenient to consider the apartment separately, with respect to each of its two uses, namely, as the sacristy proper, or place wherein all articles required in the services are preserved, and prepared for use, and as the vestry, or place where the clergy vest and unvest before and after officiating in the church.

It is of the first importance in a sacristy that there should be a distinct place for every object, however insignificant, and also that everything should be easily accessible whenever it is wanted. It is further necessary that no room be wasted by clumsy arrangements, and that all presses, &c., be contrived so as to give the maximum accommodation, whilst occupying the minimum of space. It is absolutely necessary that the fittings should be specially made for the purpose; the ordinary domestic furniture, which we often see introduced into sacristies, not only is inconvenient in itself, but greatly

encroaches upon space, which is rarely too abundant. A confusedly crowded sacristy is a great nuisance, everything should be as compact and tidy as in the cabin of a ship.

The receptacles for vestments, being the most bulky, require consideration first. Linen vestments, albes, and surplices, are best hung up, and for them a closet like that in the choir vestry should be provided. Some copes may also be hung up, but as a rule all silk and velvet vestments should be laid flat. The mediæval quadrant-shaped cope-chests, of which a few examples remain, should not be imitated; supposing such a one to be full, and a vestment wanted from near the bottom, everything above it would have to be taken out in order to get at it. I doubt whether they were used formerly except for large suits of copes, all of which would be wanted at once, and the like of which no English parish church now possesses, or is likely to possess. In large sacristies, vestment-cases with shallow, quadrant-shaped drawers, turning on the centres, such as are found in some French churches, may be used; but I think few copes will be the worse for being folded, so as to fit into rectangular drawers of moderate width, which occupy so much less space than the others, that they should generally be preferred. For Eucharistic vestments a chest of shallow drawers, each about three feet broad and four feet six inches long, should be provided; the number of them being regulated by the probable requirements of the church, so that each suit of vestments may have its own drawer. There should, however, never be less than

six, and the whole chest should not much pass four feet in height; if a sufficient number of drawers cannot be kept within that, a second set should be provided, or the upper ones will not be convenient to use. These drawers are intended to contain, not only the chasubles and tunicles, but everything properly belonging to each suit of vestments, and rarely used except in connection with it, including the altar-frontal (unless from the richness of its material or workmanship it is not desirable to fold it, in which case a long, shallow drawer should be specially provided for it) and copes, if any belong to the set; but this at present is exceptional; where it is likely to happen, the drawers ought to be made about five feet long. We should endeavour to provide that all things, which may be wanted on any occasion, may at once be got at by opening a single drawer. A drawer should be set apart for vestments in regular daily use, and there should also be one for altar linen. Stoles, used with surplices, may hang with them in their closet. A separate closet should be provided for the vestments intended for servers.

Plate is not now usually kept in the church; where it is, an iron fire-proof safe must be built into the wall for its protection. But there are many other objects connected with the services or the decoration of the church besides the vestments, for the safe keeping of which provision should be made in the sacristy. Candlesticks, flower-vases, and the like, are best kept in a cupboard or closet with shelves; candles in drawers divided into compartments of different sizes. When a

church possesses various sets of hangings, I think a large chest will be found the best thing to contain those not in use. Banners should be removed from their staves, and hung one behind another in a shallow cupboard against the wall; those with costly embroidery being put into linen cases before being hung up. The staves may either stand in a corner, or be laid on hooked brackets projecting from the wall, high enough up to be out of the way.

All this enumeration of drawers and closets sounds very complicated and elaborate; but, in practice, with good management the whole may be packed together into a surprisingly small space; and the few pounds which it will cost, will, I am sure, be money well spent.

The objects preserved in the sacristy have also to be prepared for use there. Cleaning is a very dirty process, which it is desirable as much as possible to keep outside, but this cannot be done entirely. Where it can be managed, there may be a sort of *back sacristy*, or closet opening out of the sacristy, in which all dirty work can be done; in other cases a table should be placed in the most out-of-the-way corner, and provided with a flap or lid, like an old-fashioned wash-hand stand, which, being shut down, would cover up all dusters, candle-chippings, &c., and prevent them from being trodden about all over the place. There should be a *piscina* or drain in the wall for pouring away water used in washing altar linen and the like. In order to provide embers for the censer, there should be an iron bracket, projecting from

the wall, holding a small wire basket over a gas-jet; it should be surmounted by a hood with a metal flue, connected with the chimney, if there is one near, or, if not, carried to the outside of the building. The box in which the charcoal is kept should be near, and the chance of pieces being dropped upon the floor reduced as much as may be.

The requirements of the sacristy as a vestry are few and simple. The first is a long table, upon which the vestments may be laid out in proper order, ready for the clergy when preparing for services. The vestment-case itself may be so arranged that its top will form this table. Next, there should be a lavatory at which the priest may wash before and after celebrating. Where it can be done, water ought to be laid on, and a tap placed over the lavatory; and near it there must be a provision for suspending a towel. In some continental sacristies I have seen two towels inscribed above, respectively, "*Ante Missam*," and "*Post Missam;*" this seems to be worthy of imitation.

No sacristy ought to be without a time-piece, by which the clergy may learn the exact moment at which they ought to enter the church; for it is not well that they should be late; or that, having entered the church too early, they should either begin before the prescribed time, or pause awkwardly until it has arrived. There should also be at least one chair in a sacristy—not a "church" chair, but a good, substantial piece of furniture, which looks as if it were meant to be sat upon.

Besides the sacristy, the larger churches should be

provided with some place in which chairs and other bulky articles may be stowed away when not wanted. This may be a chamber in the tower, or even in the roof of the church, or it may be a vault below it; all that is necessary is, that it should be free from damp, and moderately well lighted. If it be above or below the floor of the church, there should be a trap-door, by which objects may be raised or lowered, without the necessity of carrying them up or down staircases.

## *SECTION XXII.*

### OF THE BELFRY AND BELLS.

I AM not going to write an essay either on bell-founding, bell-hanging, bell-ringing, or the history and antiquity of bells. Those who wish for information on those subjects, may find abundance of it in Ellacombe's and Denison's books, and in Mr Fowler's paper in the *Sacristy*.[1] But although others, far more competent than myself, have treated of them, bells form too important a part of the furniture of a parish church for me to pass them over without notice, and there are still, I think, a few points to which it is worth while to call attention.

Every church must have one bell, and it is better that there should be more, because bells have to be sounded with different meanings, and where there is but one, it is difficult, and indeed almost impossible, to make a distinction between them. But peals of bells have no ecclesiastical use, and whether they are desirable additions to churches, I think, depends very much upon circumstances. In a village, or small town, where a comparatively small bell can be heard for a considerable distance, a peal of them, which can be rung out merrily on suitable occasions in testimony of the general rejoicing, is certainly a very good thing. But in a large and busy town such a peal

[1] See Preface.

has no chance, and its feeble struggles to be heard sound anything but merry. In London, for instance, a bell of thirty hundredweight—a very good average weight for a tenor—goes for very little, and I think that, instead of adding to it a peal of still smaller bells, it would be better to put the whole weight of metal into two or three good bells. These would serve all practical purposes better, and be audible further than the small ones, and would make less noise in their own immediate neighbourhood.[1] And, when rung together, their sound if not *merry*, would at least be dignified, whilst that of the others is neither. There is of course no reason why a church should not have a peal of heavy bells, but I think no town peal should have its tenor under two tons at the least.

For their ecclesiastical uses the bell-ropes ought to be brought down into the church itself, but where peal ringing is practised, there ought to be a separate chamber. This chamber, however, ought only to be accessible through the church, in order that proper command may be kept over it; and it should be kept decent, and well ordered, and the idea of its being a part of the church carefully kept up.

It is best for all bells, and particularly for large ones, not to hang, as is now usual in England, in separate cages placed on a strong floor, level with the sills of the belfry windows, but in one large frame standing on corbels as

[1] When the bells are worked with a machine, as they often are in London, they are *very* noisy and very offensive, but they cannot be heard far. Machines should not be allowed, where there is only one man, let him toll one bell. Machine ringing is as bad as organ grinding.

low down as possible in the tower, and rising so high that the mouths of the bells, when at rest, are a few feet above the window sills; this is good both for the tower and the bells. For the tower, because it brings the weight of the bells low down, and, if the frame is properly made, reduces the vibration of the tower consequent on the ringing of the bells to a minimum. For the bells themselves because it places them where their sound has the best chance of getting out. A frame of this sort should only touch the tower at the corbels from which it springs, and should, if room permit, narrow considerably as it goes up, in order to prevent stupid people from *steadying* it by wedging it tight to the walls, and thereby seriously endangering the stability of the tower. The lead floor for the protection of the lower part of the tower from rain and melting snow, ought to be independent of the frame. It may be below it, or part-way up it, the timbers of the frame passing through properly contrived holes in the floor; but the floor ought never to be close under the mouths of the bells, or it will tend to deaden their sound.

There ought to be at least two floors between the bell chamber and the ringing chamber, or if there can be only one, it ought to be well packed.

Where a *sanctus* bell is wanted, the question will arise whether the architect ought to make any special provision for it, and if so, what? It is tolerably certain, that, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the *sanctus* bell was a small bell set apart for its special purpose, and, generally hanging away from the other bells; very often not in the steeple at all, but in a turret or gable over the

chancel arch. This arrangement seems still to be very suitable to country churches. But in towns the custom which exists in some places of using the largest bell for the *sanctus*, seems to be more in accordance with the spirit of Archbishop Pecham's constitution, in commenting upon which Lyndwode remarks,[1] "*Hæc pulsatio fieri debet de campanis illis quæ longius possent audiri.*" Where this is to be done the architect must provide, by a squint, if necessary, that the sexton, when handling the bell rope, shall be able to see the altar.[2]

Musical chimes are an ornamental addition to the belongings of a church, to which no objection can be made. But I cannot agree with those who would have us adopt the Flemish *carillons*. Apart from the constant jarring of chords, which do not work exactly together, the feeble tinkling of a lot of little bells is far inferior in effect to the old English chime on eight or ten bells of reasonable size. The *carillon* at Boston is as satisfactory as any of the Belgian ones which I have heard, but I should be sorry to see any more such set up in England. The proposal to place one in St Paul's Cathedral is almost comic, seeing that the five ton bell on which the clock strikes, is often scarcely audible in the churchyard.

[1] Quoted by Mr Edward Peacock in the *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London*. 2d series, vol. v. p. 27.

[2] If the sackering bell is also used, this is scarcely necessary.

## *SECTION XXIII.*

### OF CLOCKS, SAND-GLASSES, AND SUN-DIALS.

THE custom of providing churches with some apparatus for measuring time, dates back far beyond the use of the clock, as we understand the word. It is indeed probable that the first clocks were produced in monasteries, for in them mechanism was most likely to be studied, and also there was need of some means of measuring time, not only by day, when the sun-dial might be used, but also at night, in order that the canonical hours might be properly kept. But, whatever be its origin, it is certain that the clock of wheel-work early became common in churches.[1] In England until quite recent times almost every church had its clock. But at the present moment it is the exception for a new church to be provided with one ; indeed, an architect is now not unfrequently called

[1] Durandus (Lib. I., Cap. I., Sec. 35), writing in the latter half of the thirteenth century, speaks of the *horologium* as if it were part of the usual furniture of a church. But it is possible that it was some sort of water-clock or rather alarum, like the *horologium* from which the monks of St Edmundsbury fetched water to put out a fire in their church in 1198. (See Jocelin of Brakelond, Camden Society's edition, p. 78.) De Honecort in his sketch book (c. 1245), has drawn "li masons don orologe," which his editors believe to be intended for a wheel-clock, though there is nothing which shows it with certainty. Many large churches are known to have had wheel-clocks in the fourteenth century.

upon to build a whole church, for about the price of a good clock and bells, without which, little more than half a century ago, none would have been considered complete.

Church clocks are of two sorts, external and internal. We have to consider of each of these, whether it should now be introduced, and if so, what form should be given to it. The external clock has really nothing to do with the church or its services, but is set up for the benefit of the neighbourhood, in the steeple, as being the most convenient and conspicuous position which can be found for it, and also that the church bells may be used for it to strike upon. I suppose that at the present time there are few houses in England which do not possess a clock of some sort, and consequently the necessity for public clocks is not now so great as it once was. But they still have a use, if it be only to afford a common standard by which the private clocks may be regulated. I think, therefore, that in all villages and small towns, where there is no other public clock, one may very properly be provided in the steeple; but in large towns they are rather a nuisance than otherwise, from their frequently not keeping exact time.[1] A little inaccuracy in one clock, which is the standard of a whole neighbourhood, is of little importance; but when there are twenty

[1] I have myself heard the clocks of London striking midnight for more than five minutes. The clock of the Houses of Parliament has, however, done away with the practical inconvenience, for, being audible everywhere, it has superseded all others. Nevertheless, close to it are the clock of the abbey, and that of St Margaret's church, and, only a little further off, that of the Horse Guards with its horrible "ting tang."

standards the case is different. Town churches are therefore best without external clocks.

A clock being decided upon, we have next to determine the number, position, size, and architectural treatment of its dials; first, however, noting that there are cases in which the dial may be altogether omitted. I do not know that I should ever deliberately design a tower intended to contain a clock, without making some provision for a dial, though it is really of very little use. It is the striking which is of real value, and I cannot help thinking that the slight advantage of a dial is a poor compensation for the disfigurement often caused to an old tower by its introduction.

If there are dials, they must be placed where they are most likely to be visible to the largest number of persons. This will depend on the position of the church; if, as is often the case in villages, it stands a little apart from the houses, one dial facing them will be sufficient. If the church stands more amongst the other buildings, there may be two, three, or four dials, as the situation dictates. The best position for a dial is the usual one; namely, the stage immediately below the belfry. It is there sufficiently raised to be well visible. If placed higher it will appear insignificant, or else it must be made so large as to subordinate the tower to it. But a clock in a church steeple is, it should be remembered, only an accidental addition, not the main cause of its erection, as is often the case in the tower of a civil building. There is a very good formula used by clockmakers to determine the proper size of a dial. which is,

that its diameter should be one foot for every ten in the height of the centre from the ground, *plus* two feet. Thus a dial thirty feet up should be five feet across; one fifty feet up, seven. If it be kept below the belfry windows, a dial will, by this rule, never become too large for the tower.

The treatment of the dial itself should be such as to render it distinctly visible without being obtrusive. It should generally be confined within the circle forming its circumference, and all frames and other external additions, especially projecting canopies and such-like unquiet Gothicnesses, should be avoided. Dials standing out at right angles from the wall are only suitable to narrow streets in towns, where, as I have said, it is best not to have a clock. Illuminated dials are ugly, expensive to keep up, and, in the majority of cases, useless. They are quite right in railway stations, and places where people have business to do in the night-time; but in a church-tower standing by an ordinary thoroughfare they are of little use, and, moreover, it will generally happen that the places where the cost of illumination need not be considered, are precisely those in which the clock itself is least needed.

A dial is not necessarily a disfigurement to a tower, though it is often made so. The points to be aimed at are to keep it simple, and to make it harmonise with its surroundings. In some situations a square board painted white, with the dial marked out in black, is sufficient. This is very suitable to unpretentious village towers; against a brick wall a black board with gold figures is better.

A skeleton dial of cast-iron gilt may be used almost anywhere. But I think the very best treatment in a highly finished work is to cut the dial into the ashlar itself, sinking the middle portion just sufficiently to allow the hour hand to pass behind the minute hand, which should be kept quite close to the face of the wall. With some stones it is sufficient to leave the area of the dial untouched, but, with others, in order to make the hands more visible, it may be stained by some neutral tint. All the incised lines and the hands must be gilt. Or the wall may be left its natural colour, and the lines and hands blackened. In every form of dial, if anything be added by way of decoration besides the circles and figures, care should be taken not to confuse these. It is best that the division into twelve be kept throughout; and that the minutes be marked by dots in the outer circle; every fifth dot being larger than the others.

Convex dials should never be used, their upper part becomes so foreshortened as to throw the divisions nearly out of sight, and the hands, if straight, are at their ends so far from the dial, that it is difficult to say what they are pointing at, and, if curved, are very ugly. Concave dials are not so bad, but are still objectionable.

The hands are best kept very simple; the minute hand should be a plain rod somewhat narrowed towards the end, the distinction between it and the hour hand is best marked by giving the latter an enlarged end. In a large dial, where counterpoises are necessary, part of them may be placed outside the dials, and so the apparent length of the hands increased, but they must be kept

short, or they may become confused with the hour hand.

The clock itself may be placed in any position which is conveniently near to the dials, and as much as possible protected from interference of any kind. In a new tower a recess in the wall should be provided for the passage of the weights without cutting through the floors. If the weights come so low as to be visible from the interior of the church—which should be avoided—the recess in which they hang should be closed with an easily removeable wooden casing; the same should also be done for some height above the ringing-floor.

The custom of placing clocks inside churches is at least as ancient, even if it be not more so, than that of placing them outside. The famous clocks of the Middle Ages, of which such wonders are related, were nearly all internal. Clocks were until comparatively recently not uncommon inside English churches, but it is now very seldom that one is set up, and the old ones are rapidly disappearing together with the western galleries, in or in front of which they were generally placed. I think they ought to be retained. Punctuality is a great virtue, which some parsons, however in other respects exemplary, do not possess in a very high degree; and loss of time in beginning, especially at early week-day services, is often a serious inconvenience to men attending them, indeed it is not unlikely to lead to their not attending at all. Now a clock in the church, by which it is understood that the services are regulated, is one of the surest means of obtaining punctuality. The clock strikes: and if the priest is not

ready to begin, it continues to bear testimony against him till he is. His watch may be slow, but that is no excuse. The church clock is the standard.

This is one argument for placing a clock in a church, and also a reason for its being made to strike; but if there is a large clock in the tower, it will serve the purpose almost equally well, especially if there be a dial inside the church. Indeed, with a western tower containing a clock, an internal dial should always be contrived. Over the tower arch is, in every respect, a good position for it. This arrangement has the advantage of securing a correspondence between the dials inside and outside; but each should have its own striking apparatus, for it is not desirable that the striking of the large clock should be very distinctly audible inside the building.

Where there is not a tower-clock, a good eight-day clock in a suitable case should be placed in some not very conspicuous position in the body of the church. It should be visible from the pulpit, so that the preacher's eye may easily rest upon it; and he may regulate his sermon accordingly. This is not a fanciful requirement; some substitute for the old sand-glass is a real need. The sand-glass seems to have passed out of use in English churches after 1660, probably owing to the abuse of it by the Puritan preachers during their usurpation; but long after that date it was common to provide a rest for the preacher's watch in the pulpit. This ceased to be provided, most likely on account of the exclusive use, during the "Georgian" period, of written sermons, the length of which was regulated in

the study. The modern revival of extempore preaching calls for a corresponding provision of a means to regulate it; for the speaker is, of himself, often quite incapable of judging of the length or shortness of the time he occupies. The sand-glass is a very imperfect contrivance, for, besides requiring to be turned at the beginning of the sermon, it has only one fixed time to run, and gives little or no indication of the passage of time in the interim; whilst the periods, which, according to circumstances, may be assigned to sermons, vary at least from five minutes to an hour; and, if a preacher has several subjects to speak upon, it is convenient for him to know exactly how his time goes. And, further, the use of the sand-glass having now entirely disappeared from our ordinary daily life, its revival in churches for this one purpose would be pedantic. We live in an age of revivals, and it is important that we should distinguish between those which are legitimate and to be encouraged, and those which are not so. I do not here speak of art revivals, but of practical matters. Nothing ought to be revived except with a distinct and well understood purpose, such as the bringing into prominence of some neglected doctrine of the Church, or the greater convenience or seemliness in the performance of the services. The mere ignorant revival of things for no other reason than that they were so five centuries ago, leads to absurdities as great as the modern Scotch tournament, or the drawbridge and portcullis with which a worthy cockney defended the front door of his "villa." In private life these things do no harm, beyond rendering their

perpetrators ridiculous; but publicly practised in the name of the Church, they tend greatly to lessen the dignity of her services, and to bring her doctrines into contempt.

A watch has many advantages over a sand-glass, but it has also its disadvantages. Being now generally worn attached to the person, it is not convenient to draw it out, and lay it at one's side as was formerly done. And to take it from the pocket from time to time, besides being very inconvenient to a man in a surplice, is too visible an operation, and does not really serve the purpose. The preacher does not want to discover suddenly that his time has expired, and that he must conclude, but to know all along how it is going. Nothing will enable him to do this so well as a clock, placed where his eye can rest upon it, whilst he continues to address the people. If it be not too dark, the best position for the clock will generally be against the north or south aisle wall towards its east end; if it be on the opposite side to the pulpit, which, if the distance is not too great, will be most convenient, it should be about in a line with it; if it be on the same side, it ought to be further west, so as not to be behind the preacher. If, as often happens in old churches, there is space over the arch into a western tower, I can see no harm in there being a dial of considerable size there. I have known clocks to be let into the ledge of the pulpit where no one but the preacher can see them. But this seems to lessen their usefulness.

I have alluded to the striking of the clock as useful in marking the exact moment at which the service ought to

begin. For this purpose it ought to sound each quarter of an hour. There is no gain in the hour being struck, indeed, so long as each fifteen minutes is distinctly marked, the less striking there is the better. The only English churches I know, which at the present time contain striking clocks, are Westminster Abbey and St Alban's, Holborn; at the former it is the custom to stop the striking during the time the services are going on. This, however, need not be, if the striking is not too loud. It ought to be just sufficient to be audible all over the church. At St Alban's it does not appear to be any annoyance.

Reasons have already been given for placing a time-piece in the vestry. It is of the greatest importance that this and the clock in the church should be kept well together. If, therefore, by any means one can be made to serve for both, so much the better. It is possible that now and then this may be managed, either by having two dials, one towards the church and one towards the vestry; or by making a "squint" from the vestry, which will command the clock in the church.

If clocks inside churches ever become "correct," we may look to see some good man, with more money than wit, and seeking to be more "correct" than his neighbours, attempting to reproduce one of the mediæval automaton clocks, of which the descriptions, and in some instances the remains, still exist.[1] Such a revival is

[1] I believe this has already been done in France. I have a recollection of seeing a drawing of a new clock of this sort lately, but cannot now call to mind where.

most strongly to be condemned. In mechanism the wonders of one age are the toys of the next. In the fourteenth century these clocks were the dedication to the service of God of the highest mechanical skill of the time. Now, in the nineteenth, "Chaunteclere" flapping his wings and cock-a-doodle-do-ing the hour, or the twelve apostles nodding their heads in procession, or Balaam's donkey jerking with kneeless legs out at one door and in at another, are inconsistent with the dignity of a church, and fit only to excite the wonderment of children in a travelling peep-show.

This seems to be the proper place to notice the sun-dial, which deserves not to be passed over in absolute silence. The most ancient objects of church furniture in England are sun-dials; of them *alone*, I believe, have we instances which undoubtedly date back to Saxon times.[1] In the later Middle Ages they do not seem to have been common in England, but during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries they again became usual; so that at the present time they are very frequently to be found on the walls of our old churches. A sun-dial is of no practical use; its indications seldom agree with those of the clock, and the corrections required to make them so are so complicated, that few

1 They are all very much alike, being incised semicircles with lines radiating from the centre, in which was inserted the gnomon. Some of the radii are distinguished by cross lines, and these, the Rev. J. T. Fowler tells me, mark the canonical hours. Most of the dials have inscriptions, and one at Kirkdale in Yorkshire is dated. They are so numerous, that considering how few architectural features of so remote a date remain to us, we may fairly infer that a sun-dial was a usual feature in a Saxon church.

of those who have charge of the clocks, would be able to regulate them by it, as was suggested might be done, by a reviewer of this when it first appeared. Some men, however, attach a value to it as a silent witness of the imperceptible but never halting passage of time; and so long as too much importance is not given to it, no harm can come from its occasional introduction. A good terse motto is a desirable addition to a sun-dial, but that subject is beyond our present limits.

## *SECTION XXIV.*

### OF ARTIFICIAL LIGHTING.

THE proper lighting of a church, especially if it be of any considerable size, is one of the most difficult questions with which an architect has to deal; and it is one which has very rarely received a perfectly satisfactory solution. The problem is to sufficiently light up the interior, without injuring it either actually or æsthetically. Most churches are now either over-lighted or under-lighted, and where gas is used, it is usually so arranged as to cause unsightly smoke stains, even if it do not cause real material injury to the fabric; whilst, with all methods, the lighting apparatus not seldom form ugly excrescences by day, and at night rather damage than improve the appearance of the building.

A church may be lighted by means of either candles, oil-lamps, or gas, the last of which, although open to more objections than either of the other two, has at the same time so many practical advantages, that where it can be obtained, it is pretty certain to be used in preference to them, and may therefore be discussed first; the more ancient methods being looked upon as exceptional.

The disadvantages of gas are, that it vitiates the air rapidly, and gives off products which are in the highest

degree injurious to books, pictures, hangings, or any other organic substances, including human eyes, with which they come in contact; that it makes much smoke; that it easily overheats any apartment in which it is used; and that its light is not a pleasant one. The first two of these faults might be much lessened, if the companies would be good enough to supply us with coal gas in a reasonably pure condition; but, as they will not, and there seems to be no means of making them, and to set up private gas works, to supply a church, would be both costly and inconvenient, we must either not use gas at all, or be content with bad, and make our arrangements accordingly. The advantages which are generally held to outweigh these formidable objections to the use of gas, are its cheapness, the ease with which it can be manipulated, both in fixing and in use afterwards, and above all, its exceeding untroublesomeness. No renewal or preparation of any kind is required, and, as it is commonly used in churches, not even any cleaning; a few taps only are turned, and all is ready for lighting, and by the same means all may again be extinguished.

A church may be either entirely lighted up so as to display the whole interior, or just so much light as is absolutely required for use may be supplied in the places where it is wanted, and nowhere else. Where gas is used, the first of these methods is generally aimed at; indeed, owing to the great ease with which gas-jets can be multiplied, there are far oftener too many than too few of them, whereby gas bills are unnecessarily magnified. The other method has the merit of economy, and æstheti-

cally is far from unpleasing, especially in large buildings. But there is a festal effect about a brilliantly-illuminated interior, which it is desirable to keep within our power, so that it seems best to provide for it, but at the same time to arrange that a greater or less amount of light may be used as may be needed; and this by having certain jets turned on at full, where they are wanted, not by lighting the whole, and turning it down low; as is now not unfrequently done during sermons, whereby a feeling of drowsiness is spread over the congregation, for which the preacher is no doubt credited, but which is really due to the defective manner of lighting.

Lighting with gas is now done by means of lines of jets following string courses or other architectural features, brackets projecting from walls or pillars, standards rising from the floor, or more rarely pendants hanging from the roof. The first of these is absolutely and entirely bad, and however good its light may be, should never be allowed under any circumstances. Its least evil is, that it terribly blackens the walls. It is also a source of danger to the building, for long lines of light are almost necessarily placed high up and near the roof, and the heat given off by them is sufficient to scorch the timbers, and even to set them on fire. Just above the clerestory string is a favourite place for such lines of gas jets, and although this may be ten feet or more below any wood work, I have known them have to be removed after a very short trial, on account of their effect upon the roof. Nor is the injury always confined to wood; it will affect all surface decoration of the walls, and even the stone

work itself, the glass and the lead of the windows, and in short everything which is near.

The keeping of gas-jets near to the walls, and making them follow the lines of the architecture, originates in a desire to conceal the means of lighting, and thereby avoid any "unmediæval" feature in the church. This is of course absurd, and indeed flatly impossible; for what is to be the source of light at night must, if fixed, necessarily be visible by day. And what can be more hideous or "ungothic" than a great, black, prickly-backed gas-pipe, running about over string-courses and cornices, just where the eye cannot help being caught by it? If gas is to be used at all, it must be accepted as part of the necessary furniture of the church, and rationally treated, according to its own requirements, and the exigencies of the main design; neither concealed nor disguised on the one hand, nor on the other exaggerated to an importance inconsistent with the secondary function it has to perform; and whatever capabilities it may possess, for improving or adding to the whole composition of the interior, should be seized upon and turned to the best artistic use.

The second way of applying gas to lighting churches is by means of projecting brackets. As has been just said, gas jets must be kept away from the walls, which their smoke will otherwise blacken. A separation of a few inches is not enough to prevent this, it must at least be of several feet; and, consequently, if brackets are used, they must be of very considerable projection, and are liable, when seen laterally, to appear as ugly parasites,

rather than natural belongings to the building. There is a further aesthetic objection to a gas-bracket attached to a pillar—the most usual position—that the pipe supplying it, must either visibly approach it from above or below, accommodating itself as best it can to the base or cap, or any other architectural features in its way, which has always an exceedingly mean, and as it were *temporary* appearance; or it must be somehow concealed within the pillar, in which case the knowledge of its existence entirely destroys the idea of absolute solidity, which is felt to be essential to a pillar. This objection does not hold against a bracket projecting from a wall, for if the wall be flat, the pipe may without offence rise directly to it from the floor, and in all cases there is the possibility of its passing through the wall from the other side. Brackets, then, are admissible in some positions, but, except in very small, single-span churches, they can rarely, if ever, form the sole or principal means of lighting. Near doors, and in such odd places where a little extra light is wanted, a bracket of one or more jets will generally be the most convenient way of supplying it. And on the west wall of a nave, or in a vestibule or antechurch, where such a desirable feature exists, brackets of considerable size and projection may with discretion be very properly used.

If we may not supply the lighting from the walls and pillars, we must do so from the floor or from the roof. So far as efficiency of lighting is concerned, standards or pendants may be used indifferently, for in any place where a certain number of burners may be supported

from the floor, the same might be suspended from the roof, and *vice versâ*. We have, therefore, to inquire whether there are any reasons why either of these should usually be chosen rather than the other.

Both standards and pendants must almost necessarily be arranged in lines along the building from east to west. Down the middle is, though possible, not convenient with standards, and with pendants it is not desirable, for although one central pendant in the choir may, if properly managed, look very well, a row of them down the middle seems to cut a church unpleasantly in two, besides choking it up and making it appear low. And further, it is not well that all the light should be concentrated along the axis of the building.

The usual position for standards, viz., in the lines of the arcades, is a very bad one, as is soon shown by the blackening of the arches and of the wall above them. If, to avoid this, the standards are placed in the aisles outside the arcades, the whole upper portion of the nave is thrown into shadow. And if, on the other hand, they stand in the nave itself, they have an effect of lessening the apparent size of the building to an extent, which will scarcely be credited by those who have not studied the matter, and watched the result of their erection in known buildings. The eye, instead of resting upon the arcades, seems to be caught by the two lines of standards, and the distance between them, not that between the walls, is taken for the width of the nave. The effect of pendants similarly arranged is exactly the opposite. The eye, passing under them, at once takes in the whole width,

whilst the subdivision which they cause in the upper part of the building, tends greatly to magnify both the width and the height.

This last-mentioned system of lighting is by far the best which can be chosen for the body of a church, for, besides its æsthetic merits, if the pews be arranged in two blocks as I have recommended, it brings the light just where it is of the most use, namely, about over the centre line of each block of pews.

There are two other reasons, each by itself of considerable weight, why pendants are preferable to standards for general use. First, that standards are often inconvenient obstacles in the pews, and being continually knocked against, an escape of gas is certain, sooner or later, to occur from them. And second, that the pipes supplying them must be under the floor, and are consequently inconvenient to get at, should any repairs be necessary; this is particularly the case under the wooden floors of the pews. With pendants the pipes may be arranged so that every part of them is at once accessible.

It is very usual to see two standards placed one on either side of the sanctuary. In that position they are just admissible, but I think not commendable. They are intended to be ornamental, but gas should not be used with that intention; ornamental lighting is occasional, and should be over and above the actual requirements of illumination, and moreover it should at least *be* ornamental. Now there is a certain hardness and unpleasantness of colour about a gas jet, which

prevents its ever being a pleasing object to look upon. As an illuminator it is tolerable, but to that utilitarian function it should be strictly confined. Wax candles alone should be used for decorative purposes; there is a softness about their light, which is always pleasing, and being superfluities, their cost is no argument against them. All ornament ought to be costly; unless it be the best of its sort it is no ornament at all.

Some men have a great fancy for throwing upon the altar a strong light from a concealed source; indeed, I remember that one clerical speaker at the Leeds Church Congress wanted the whole church to be so lighted. Now the conditions of a church, and those of a theatre, are totally different. Upon the stage of a theatre the endeavour is to present to the spectators, who are outside it, the appearance as of daylight, or if a night scene be represented, real or apparent sources of light are shown. But there is nothing of this sort in a church; we want no false daylight there, even if such a thing were possible, when, if I may be allowed to say so, the whole spectators are on the stage. Trickery of all kinds is offensive in church, and in the lighting no less than in other things; besides, the whole trick is at once visible, and the effect is most unpleasant. When it is confined to the altar, it makes it look as if it were close to the screen, and by diminishing its apparent size and distance away, completely defeats the purpose, if that be, as I suppose, to give greater dignity and importance to the altar.

Besides the means of lighting hitherto mentioned, there are sunlights, and some others which possess the

great advantage of drawing off the products of combustion to the exterior of the building. But, unfortunately, it happens that, either from their complicated form, and consequent liability to get out of order, the amount of attention they require, or from some other causes, none of them appear to be suitable for general use in churches. Sunlights may be, and, indeed, sometimes have been, used in somewhat low and ceiled buildings; and it is possible that some arrangement of what are called "ventilating globe-lights," might occasionally be found to work well; but in the greater number of cases it will be necessary to use open burners. For reasons already given, the best arrangement of these is in two rows of pendants along the nave, at some little distance from the arcade walls. These two rows may either be carried eastward into the chancel, or that may be lighted by a single larger central pendant. Aisles of ordinary width will receive sufficient light from the nave, and brackets of one or more jets should be fixed in any places specially requiring them.

If there is a ceiling, which, as will be shown in the next section, is always best, the suspending pipes of the pendants should pass through it, the main pipes being above it. By this means the latter are kept out of sight, and the whole is easily accessible for occasional inspection and repairs. But if an open timber roof is used, the main-pipes may, without difficulty, be placed in it, so as not to become eyesores. And, in all cases, the pendants ought to hang from the roof; not from cranes projecting from the walls, as is sometimes seen.

No practical advantage is gained by the use of these cranes; on the contrary, they are open to some of the objections urged against brackets. And, æsthetically, besides unpleasantly cutting up some of the main lines of the building, they have an overworked and insecure appearance, entirely destructive to that repose which should characterise every feature in a monumental interior.

The forms of the pendants have next to be considered, and here we are met by two of the canons of "correctness," which require a little investigation. The first is, that all pendants, whether for gas or candles, must be "*coronæ*," which, being interpreted, means *rings*, or, at least, objects approaching as nearly to the circular form as the Gothic minds of the tailors, or "art-metal workers," will allow them to adopt. The second, that where gas is used, it must be in a large number of very small jets. We will take the latter first. What the supposed advantages of the small jets are, I am unable to say; possibly it may be imagined that they resemble the flames of candles. The real disadvantages are not so difficult to discover; they are much more trouble to light than large jets, and with them the chances of one being overlooked in the lighting, and thus becoming an annoyance, are much increased; and quantity for quantity of gas consumed, the small jets give very much less light than the large ones. The *corona*, or circular form of pendant, is not necessarily to be condemned, it is often perfectly legitimate; but I protest against any law compelling its use to the exclusion of all others.

Indeed, with gas, the balance of reasons will generally be against it; for the gas being supplied by the suspending pipe, and the lights being arranged round it, the pendant must necessarily take a radiating form in order to connect them. The circle, therefore, is not, as in the mediæval chandeliers, the essential part of the machine, but merely an ornament which may or may not be used according to taste.

Perhaps the best form which can be given to a gas pendant of moderate size, is a more or less ornamented ball of cast metal terminating the suspending pipe, with arms branching from it according to the required number of jets, of which the fewer the better, so long as sufficient light is supplied. A few bands and a little simple scroll work of wrought iron is sufficient ornament for the pipe.

Globes are seldom used in churches, and indeed they are a source of some trouble in cleaning and of expense in replacing breakages, but on the other hand they are of great use in diffusing and softening the light. The same objections hold against argand burners, but they are much the best illuminators, and a comparatively small number will suffice.

Every pendant and bracket ought to be provided with a special tap, and the larger pendants with several, so that if need be any one may either be used by itself or cut off when the rest are used. But besides this it is a good plan, and although it involves a little extra outlay at first, really an economical one, to lay on the gas from the meter by several main pipes instead of one only, con-

necting the lights, not according to their nearness to one another, but according to the best methods of lighting of the building or parts of it under probable conditions, when to light up the whole would be unnecessary. In the first place, the chancel and the body of the church may be used independently of one another, their lighting should therefore be independent. Again, the body of the church may at times, and with a full congregation, require an amount of light which at other times, and with smaller numbers present, is useless, and consequently wasteful; it is, therefore, well to have at least two different degrees of illumination at convenient command. The two eastern and the two western pendants may be connected, and used alone on week-day evenings, early mornings, at sermons, and the like. In very large buildings a third pair might be added, or the intermediate pendants might be again divided into two sets, and made so that there can be turned off together one of each pair on alternate sides. The not uncommon system of connecting together all the lights on one side is not good; for when one side only is used the light is badly distributed, besides being often more than is wanted. The lighting of a side chapel should be complete in itself, as also should that of the vestries; and it is a great convenience if near to the door, by which the custodian of the church leaves after having closed the rest for the night, there be a jet supplied from below a tap, so placed as to cut off the gas from all other parts of the building, so that the man may not be compelled to grope his way out in the dark, after turning all off at the meter.

It is much the best not to give any special light to the pulpit, but to arrange that it may receive enough from the nearest pendant. The preacher himself requires a good light; but it is exceedingly offensive to the audience, when turning to him, to find themselves compelled to stare at a bunch of gas-jets. If extra light is wanted, candles only ought to be used.

The amount of gas required at once being very variable, it would be well to provide each church with a gas-regulator, several tolerably efficient forms of which are to be had. The cost is trifling, and the effect in steadying the light considerable.

For general lighting, both candles and oil lamps are, like gas, best arranged in two rows of pendants in the nave, and one or more pendants in the chancel. Candles are becoming less and less used for this purpose, but for decorative lighting, they are to be preferred to everything else, and a few well-placed chandeliers are very valuable additions to the furniture of a church. Two in the sanctuary not only look better, but are more convenient than the usual standards. In large well-furnished churches two or even more massive brass standing candlesticks, flanking the altar on either side, are good, but they should each contain but one, or at most seven, large candles, not a large number of small ones. In the majority of churches it is, however, best to leave the sanctuary floor unencumbered. If there is a great rood in the middle of the church, two chandeliers hung high up, one on either side and a little in front of it, look very well.

The most perfect of all means of lighting is one which may be seen used in some large French churches—namely, pendants arranged as above described, and containing each six or eight moderator lamps. These give an ample, but at the same time a soft light, which is exceedingly pleasing. But, unfortunately, the oil is expensive, and the lamps require constant attention, indeed every one of them must be removed from its place, and separately trimmed, before each time of using. With such disadvantages, I fear we are not likely to see them adopted in many English churches, but for small rich buildings, and especially in those which contain valuable paintings, they are highly to be recommended. Where they are used, a lamp-room ought to be provided in addition to the vestries.

Pendants for candles and lamps require to be easily got at, and therefore should be hung so that they may be raised and lowered. Those of moderate size may be hung with counterpoise weights, and drawn down by means of a ring at the bottom, which can be reached by a hooked stick. The branched form is, therefore, better than the circular or "corona," because it possesses a centre to which the ring may be attached. But for pendants of very great diameter, such as would be used in the middle of a chancel, the circular form is best, and they should be raised or lowered from the point of suspension above the ceiling. In low buildings, where the pendants do not hang far from the floor, and may be reached by standing on a chair, or on a low pair of steps, they need not be made moveable, and in that case the

branched or circular form may be used indifferently. The best material is cast brass, but, in the hands of those who know how to use it, wrought iron may give excellent results.

Paraffine lamps are now becoming much used in places where gas is not to be had. Unless carefully attended to, they give off a very offensive smell, and often also much smoke; their cheapness is their chief recommendation, and one which must often cause their use, especially in poor country parishes. When in good order they give a steady and brilliant, but exceedingly harsh and unpleasant light, indeed they are worse in this respect than gas; they should, therefore, never be used without globes. Architecturally, they are exceedingly manageable, and are best hung from the roofs in frames containing one or three lamps each. It is, I think, better to multiply the pendants than to make them hold more than three lamps of this sort. Both lamps and frames ought to be made to order, which need not increase their cost. Those supplied by tradesmen are exceedingly offensive in form, and, if any attempt is made to give them an "ecclesiastical" character, in colour also.

Although they are not intended for the purpose of giving light, this seems to be the best place to notice those lamps, generally seven in number, which may sometimes be seen hung in sanctuaries. An architect is not likely to put them in of his own accord; but, if they are asked for, he will do well to accept them as valuable aids to his design; for no other ornaments have such an effect as they have in increasing the apparent size of an

interior; they deepen the sanctuary, and at the same time magnify both the height and width of the chancel. To obtain the full benefit of them they should be hung in a line a little east of the entrance of the sanctuary, and from the roof, not from a beam placed for the purpose lower down, any "mediæval precedent" for that arrangement notwithstanding.

## *SECTION XXV.*

### OF WARMING AND VENTILATION.

A PERFECT method of warming churches has yet to be invented, and I am myself prepared neither to bring forward any important suggestions of my own on the subject, nor to recommend any one of the systems now in use to the exclusion of the rest. They may be roughly classed under three heads—namely, stoves, placed either in the church itself, or where they have free atmospheric communication with it; pipes, containing either hot water or steam; and flues, arranged so that their upper sides form part of the pavement of the church, which thus becomes a source of heat. These I shall speak of respectively as the stove system, the pipe system, and the flue system.

It is important to remember what is possible in warming, and what is not. Apparatus are frequently condemned, when they are not really at fault. Nothing is commoner than to hear of a church, that it is never warm till the afternoon. On inquiry it will generally be found that such a church is left too cool for six consecutive days, and then a fire is lighted sometime on Sunday morning, and the place is expected to be warm and comfortable by eleven o'clock, when respectable people are

supposed to go to church. Surely a most unreasonable expectation. The large body of air which a church contains cannot be raised say twenty degrees in a moment, or in two or three hours, except by such means as would make the place unbearable when heated. If a church is in constant use, and has its warming apparatus in daily, not necessarily full, operation, and nevertheless, is found always to be cold in the earlier part of the day, then I grant that something is wrong; but it does not necessarily follow that the system of warming is alone to blame, it may be that, owing to some defect in the church itself, the air within it cools more rapidly than it should do, and thus neutralises the effect of the warming. Under the most favourable circumstances it takes a considerable time for a warming apparatus to get fully to work. We should require of it that, when at work, it shall maintain a steady regulatable and sufficient temperature uniformly throughout the building. This I believe may be done either with stoves, pipes, or flues. Each system has its good points and its bad ones, and in individual cases the balance of these will sometimes be in favour of one, and sometimes of another. And with any of them there of course may be, and often are, failures, due either to a mistaken parsimony in the first outlay, or to the incompetence of the tradesman to whom the work is entrusted. If any one method ultimately supersedes the other two, it will probably be the flue system, but before it does so it will have to receive considerable improvement.

The working out in detail of the warming apparatus

is not the duty of the architect of a church; it belongs to the tradesman whose special business it is; but the architect should arrange the general scheme, and never lose control of the work. It very often happens that this is not done, and, either from the carelessness of the architect himself, or from the ignorant interference of some churchwarden or committee-man, the church is unconditionally handed over to be warmed by some self-styled "engineer," who may be a man who understands the work, or may be, and often is, simply the local ironmonger. Whichever he be, and whether he warms the church satisfactorily or not, he is pretty certain to disfigure it, for after the manner of tradesmen he looks at the matter solely with respect to his particular craft. He starts with the supposition that the church has been built for no other reason but that he may warm it, and consequently everything must give way to his pipes, grates, stoves, and flues.[1] It is for the architect so to regulate matters that neither the efficiency of the warming apparatus is impaired, nor the appearance of the church unnecessarily injured by it. I say *unnecessarily* advisedly, for it is not always possible to keep the church absolutely uninjured.

[1] To give some idea of what these men are capable of, I may say that twice I have had to deal with men who proposed to place coils of pipes inside altars. Both expressed great surprise at this being objected to, and one, after having been with some difficulty made to understand that it would not be allowed, returned with a second scheme—to place the pipes *behind* the altar, where he insisted they could not be seen from the body of the church—and, when that also was forbidden, he complained bitterly that I would not "give him a fair chance."

The stove system is the simplest. From the number of fires required, it is inconvenient and expensive in large buildings; but that it may be successfully applied to them is proved by the use of it at St Paul's Cathedral, the largest in cubic contents, and, at the same time, one of the best warmed churches in England. Stoves may be placed either visibly in the church itself or in a separate chamber, the air in which, after having been warmed, is passed on to the church. The latter method has not much to recommend it, except when, as at St Paul's, the heating chamber is a crypt under the entire area of the church, and having frequent communication with it—a luxurious arrangement, which cannot often be obtained. When it is not so, the warmed air is rarely equally diffused through the interior, even where attempts are made to carry it to different parts by means of flues, which cause nearly as much disfigurement to the church as the pipe system, without warming it so well. Sometimes stoves are sunk separately in pits, grated over at the top level with the pavement of the church—an arrangement intermediate between the separate chambers and the visible stoves. This may sometimes be successful, but requires doing cautiously; the large grates, besides being ugly patches on the floor, are so much waste space, for it cannot be used when the stoves are in action. If adopted at all, sunk stoves must be so arranged that, even in the most crowded conditions of the church, no one will ever be likely either to sit or stand over them. Otherwise faintings, with all the accompanying confusion, will certainly be the result.

Besides their comparative cheapness, stoves placed upon the floor of the church have the advantage over other means of warming, that they require much less preparation and special adaptation of the building in which they are to be used. They are therefore especially suitable for introduction into existing buildings, particularly into ancient churches, which have been much used for interments, and almost every stone in whose pavements is a historical monument, which it would be sacrilege[1] to remove or destroy. That they are unsightly I grant. A gill stove is one of the unloveliest objects ever invented by man, but it is confined to one spot, and does not taint the whole interior with its ugliness as do the pipes and grates of an "apparatus." In old churches, stoves are always the best means of warming, and they generally are so in small, poor, modern buildings. The stove need not be placed *more majorum* in the middle of the chancel, with an iron chimney passing through the east window. It must be in some corner where it is well placed for its work, but as little visible as possible. Such corners nearly always exist in old churches, and in new ones they may easily be contrived on the plan, in which cases proper flues should be built in the walls from them. In old buildings the metal chimney may be used, and taken to the outside, either through the wall or through a window; there is really no harm in that, so long as it is

[1] This sacrilege is "correct," and consequently frightfully common. It is committed in nearly every church which is "restored." May those, who remove their ancestors' modest gravestones to make way for cast-iron gratings and "tesselated" pavements, have their own "correct" memorials broken up to mend the roads with.

done modestly; what would be an unpardonable fault in a new building, is perfectly allowable when adding to an old one a feature which its builders did not provide for; but the flue must never be carried through the roof, lest becoming overheated it should set fire to the timbers.

Much of dirt is often caused by bringing fuel into churches and keeping it there, which it will perhaps be said may all be avoided by the use of a separate apparatus room. But the fault does not lie with the stoves, or at least, if it does, it is a fault which they share with drawing-room fire-places, and I never yet heard the use of them objected to on account of the dirt caused by bringing coals through the house. Men treat a church as a kind of out-house; if they really felt at home there, they would no more think of piling coals on the pavement, or placing them there in an open box or a rickety basket, than of doing the same on a drawing-room carpet.

The pipe system is the one now most generally employed, and except for very small buildings it is more convenient than the stove system. I do not intend to discuss here the comparative merits of "high pressure" and "low pressure," or to consider in detail the various "apparatus," of which nearly every manufacturer has one to which he attaches his name. Most of them *can* warm a church, if no limit is made to the quantity of piping which may be introduced, or, what amounts to the same thing, to the sum of money which may be spent. That man is the best who can do the work effectually

It is much the best not to give any special light to the pulpit, but to arrange that it may receive enough from the nearest pendant. The preacher himself requires a good light; but it is exceedingly offensive to the audience, when turning to him, to find themselves compelled to stare at a bunch of gas-jets. If extra light is wanted, candles only ought to be used.

The amount of gas required at once being very variable, it would be well to provide each church with a gas-regulator, several tolerably efficient forms of which are to be had. The cost is trifling, and the effect in steadying the light considerable.

For general lighting, both candles and oil lamps are, like gas, best arranged in two rows of pendants in the nave, and one or more pendants in the chancel. Candles are becoming less and less used for this purpose, but for decorative lighting, they are to be preferred to everything else, and a few well-placed chandeliers are very valuable additions to the furniture of a church. Two in the sanctuary not only look better, but are more convenient than the usual standards. In large well-furnished churches two or even more massive brass standing candlesticks, flanking the altar on either side, are good, but they should each contain but one, or at most seven, large candles, not a large number of small ones. In the majority of churches it is, however, best to leave the sanctuary floor unencumbered. If there is a great rood in the middle of the church, two chandeliers hung high up, one on either side and a little in front of it, look very well.

The most perfect of all means of lighting is one which may be seen used in some large French churches—namely, pendants arranged as above described, and containing each six or eight moderator lamps. These give an ample, but at the same time a soft light, which is exceedingly pleasing. But, unfortunately, the oil is expensive, and the lamps require constant attention, indeed every one of them must be removed from its place, and separately trimmed, before each time of using. With such disadvantages, I fear we are not likely to see them adopted in many English churches, but for small rich buildings, and especially in those which contain valuable paintings, they are highly to be recommended. Where they are used, a lamp-room ought to be provided in addition to the vestries.

Pendants for candles and lamps require to be easily got at, and therefore should be hung so that they may be raised and lowered. Those of moderate size may be hung with counterpoise weights, and drawn down by means of a ring at the bottom, which can be reached by a hooked stick. The branched form is, therefore, better than the circular or "corona," because it possesses a centre to which the ring may be attached. But for pendants of very great diameter, such as would be used in the middle of a chancel, the circular form is best, and they should be raised or lowered from the point of suspension above the ceiling. In low buildings, where the pendants do not hang far from the floor, and may be reached by standing on a chair, or on a low pair of steps, they need not be made moveable, and in that case the

branched or circular form may be used indifferently. The best material is cast brass, but, in the hands of those who know how to use it, wrought iron may give excellent results.

Paraffine lamps are now becoming much used in places where gas is not to be had. Unless carefully attended to, they give off a very offensive smell, and often also much smoke; their cheapness is their chief recommendation, and one which must often cause their use, especially in poor country parishes. When in good order they give a steady and brilliant, but exceedingly harsh and unpleasant light, indeed they are worse in this respect than gas; they should, therefore, never be used without globes. Architecturally, they are exceedingly manageable, and are best hung from the roofs in frames containing one or three lamps each. It is, I think, better to multiply the pendants than to make them hold more than three lamps of this sort. Both lamps and frames ought to be made to order, which need not increase their cost. Those supplied by tradesmen are exceedingly offensive in form, and, if any attempt is made to give them an "ecclesiastical" character, in colour also.

Although they are not intended for the purpose of giving light, this seems to be the best place to notice those lamps, generally seven in number, which may sometimes be seen hung in sanctuaries. An architect is not likely to put them in of his own accord; but, if they are asked for, he will do well to accept them as valuable aids to his design; for no other ornaments have such an effect as they have in increasing the apparent size of an

interior; they deepen the sanctuary, and at the same time magnify both the height and width of the chancel. To obtain the full benefit of them they should be hung in a line a little east of the entrance of the sanctuary, and from the roof, not from a beam placed for the purpose lower down, any "mediæval precedent" for that arrangement notwithstanding.

## *SECTION XXV.*

### OF WARMING AND VENTILATIÓN.

A PERFECT method of warming churches has yet to be invented, and I am myself prepared neither to bring forward any important suggestions of my own on the subject, nor to recommend any one of the systems now in use to the exclusion of the rest. They may be roughly classed under three heads—namely, stoves, placed either in the church itself, or where they have free atmospheric communication with it; pipes, containing either hot water or steam; and flues, arranged so that their upper sides form part of the pavement of the church, which thus becomes a source of heat. These I shall speak of respectively as the stove system, the pipe system, and the flue system.

It is important to remember what is possible in warming, and what is not. Apparatus are frequently condemned, when they are not really at fault. Nothing is commoner than to hear of a church, that it is never warm till the afternoon. On inquiry it will generally be found that such a church is left too cool for six consecutive days, and then a fire is lighted sometime on Sunday morning, and the place is expected to be warm and comfortable by eleven o'clock, when respectable people are

supposed to go to church. Surely a most unreasonable expectation. The large body of air which a church contains cannot be raised say twenty degrees in a moment, or in two or three hours, except by such means as would make the place unbearable when heated. If a church is in constant use, and has its warming apparatus in daily, not necessarily full, operation, and nevertheless, is found always to be cold in the earlier part of the day, then I grant that something is wrong; but it does not necessarily follow that the system of warming is alone to blame, it may be that, owing to some defect in the church itself, the air within it cools more rapidly than it should do, and thus neutralises the effect of the warming. Under the most favourable circumstances it takes a considerable time for a warming apparatus to get fully to work. We should require of it that, when at work, it shall maintain a steady regulatable and sufficient temperature uniformly throughout the building. This I believe may be done either with stoves, pipes, or flues. Each system has its good points and its bad ones, and in individual cases the balance of these will sometimes be in favour of one, and sometimes of another. And with any of them there of course may be, and often are, failures, due either to a mistaken parsimony in the first outlay, or to the incompetence of the tradesman to whom the work is entrusted. If any one method ultimately supersedes the other two, it will probably be the flue system, but before it does so it will have to receive considerable improvement.

The working out in detail of the warming apparatus

is not the duty of the architect of a church; it belongs to the tradesman whose special business it is; but the architect should arrange the general scheme, and never lose control of the work. It very often happens that this is not done; and, either from the carelessness of the architect himself, or from the ignorant interference of some churchwarden or committee-man, the church is unconditionally handed over to be warmed by some self-styled "engineer," who may be a man who understands the work, or may be, and often is, simply the local ironmonger. Whichever he be, and whether he warms the church satisfactorily or not, he is pretty certain to disfigure it, for after the manner of tradesmen he looks at the matter solely with respect to his particular craft. He starts with the supposition that the church has been built for no other reason but that he may warm it, and consequently everything must give way to his pipes, grates, stoves, and flues.[1] It is for the architect so to regulate matters that neither the efficiency of the warming apparatus is impaired, nor the appearance of the church unnecessarily injured by it. I say *unnecessarily* advisedly, for it is not always possible to keep the church absolutely uninjured.

[1] To give some idea of what these men are capable of, I may say that twice I have had to deal with men who proposed to place coils of pipes inside altars. Both expressed great surprise at this being objected to, and one, after having been with some difficulty made to understand that it would not be allowed, returned with a second scheme—to place the pipes *behind* the altar, where he insisted they could not be seen from the body of the church—and, when that also was forbidden, he complained bitterly that I would not "give him a fair chance."

The stove system is the simplest. From the number of fires required, it is inconvenient and expensive in large buildings; but that it may be successfully applied to them is proved by the use of it at St Paul's Cathedral, the largest in cubic contents, and, at the same time, one of the best warmed churches in England. Stoves may be placed either visibly in the church itself or in a separate chamber, the air in which, after having been warmed, is passed on to the church. The latter method has not much to recommend it, except when, as at St Paul's, the heating chamber is a crypt under the entire area of the church, and having frequent communication with it—a luxurious arrangement, which cannot often be obtained. When it is not so, the warmed air is rarely equally diffused through the interior, even where attempts are made to carry it to different parts by means of flues, which cause nearly as much disfigurement to the church as the pipe system, without warming it so well. Sometimes stoves are sunk separately in pits, grated over at the top level with the pavement of the church—an arrangement intermediate between the separate chambers and the visible stoves. This may sometimes be successful, but requires doing cautiously; the large grates, besides being ugly patches on the floor, are so much waste space, for it cannot be used when the stoves are in action. If adopted at all, sunk stoves must be so arranged that, even in the most crowded conditions of the church, no one will ever be likely either to sit or stand over them. Otherwise faintings, with all the accompanying confusion, will certainly be the result.

Besides their comparative cheapness, stoves placed upon the floor of the church have the advantage over other means of warming, that they require much less preparation and special adaptation of the building in which they are to be used. They are therefore especially suitable for introduction into existing buildings, particularly into ancient churches, which have been much used for interments, and almost every stone in whose pavements is a historical monument, which it would be sacrilege[1] to remove or destroy. That they are unsightly I grant. A gill stove is one of the unloveliest objects ever invented by man, but it is confined to one spot, and does not taint the whole interior with its ugliness as do the pipes and grates of an "apparatus." In old churches, stoves are always the best means of warming, and they generally are so in small, poor, modern buildings. The stove need not be placed *more majorum* in the middle of the chancel, with an iron chimney passing through the east window. It must be in some corner where it is well placed for its work, but as little visible as possible. Such corners nearly always exist in old churches, and in new ones they may easily be contrived on the plan, in which cases proper flues should be built in the walls from them. In old buildings the metal chimney may be used, and taken to the outside, either through the wall or through a window; there is really no harm in that, so long as it is

[1] This sacrilege is "correct," and consequently frightfully common. It is committed in nearly every church which is "restored." May those, who remove their ancestors' modest gravestones to make way for cast-iron gratings and "tesselated" pavements, have their own "correct" memorials broken up to mend the roads with.

done modestly; what would be an unpardonable fault in a new building, is perfectly allowable when adding to an old one a feature which its builders did not provide for; but the flue must never be carried through the roof, lest becoming overheated it should set fire to the timbers.

Much of dirt is often caused by bringing fuel into churches and keeping it there, which it will perhaps be said may all be avoided by the use of a separate apparatus room. But the fault does not lie with the stoves, or at least, if it does, it is a fault which they share with drawing-room fire-places, and I never yet heard the use of them objected to on account of the dirt caused by bringing coals through the house. Men treat a church as a kind of out-house; if they really felt at home there, they would no more think of piling coals on the pavement, or placing them there in an open box or a rickety basket, than of doing the same on a drawing-room carpet.

The pipe system is the one now most generally employed, and except for very small buildings it is more convenient than the stove system. I do not intend to discuss here the comparative merits of "high pressure" and "low pressure," or to consider in detail the various "apparatus," of which nearly every manufacturer has one to which he attaches his name. Most of them *can* warm a church, if no limit is made to the quantity of piping which may be introduced, or, what amounts to the same thing, to the sum of money which may be spent. That man is the best who can do the work effectually

with the least machinery. What I now have to say applies to all alike.

Pipes are placed either above the pavement or below it in trenches covered with iron gratings. Pipes above the pavement have very much more heating power than those below it, but they can only be used against walls or in such like places, where room can be spared for them, and where they are out of the way. In themselves pipes are not uglier than grates in the floor, indeed they are less ugly than the very large grates which are now often used; and in interiors, whose principal aesthetic quality is *picturesqueness*, the pipes may often be left visible without offence; but in monumental interiors, that is, where the quality of *order* is most conspicuous, the pipes are best kept out of sight. As all new churches ought to belong to the latter class, this distinction practically confines visible pipes to certain existing buildings. In the poorer class of recent churches, they may often be conveniently used, and even in ancient churches where trenches ought not to be allowed, they may sometimes be admitted, although it is seldom possible to keep the pipes entirely above ground. They can only be placed against the walls, but there two, three, or even four, may be placed one above another. In a large church, which has a triforium, pipes may be put there; the success of this plan at Westminster Abbey is very remarkable.

There is a pleasant fiction which "warming engineers," and apparently also a good many architects, profess to believe, that a great black grate in a pavement is invi-

sible. It is really a pity that this is not true, it would save such a world of trouble with the afore-mentioned "engineers." And besides, if a black grate is invisible, why not a red tile? So why give one's self any trouble about a pavement which is all out of sight?[1] But in spite of the many advantages of this comfortable doctrine I find myself unable to accept it, for somehow, when the grate is there, it generally contrives to make its ugly presence known, and that without much looking for. The fact is, that these grates, to which we are now so accustomed as to accept them almost as a matter of course, are a huge disfigurement to our churches. If they are necessary—and if they are not absolutely that, it must be confessed they are very often expedient—they must be accepted, but they must be controlled and compelled to do as little harm as possible.

The first thing to do is to reduce the size of the grates. The "engineers" generally begin by saying that they *must* have the grates fifteen inches wide; this is moderate, some modestly ask for eighteen, and, if left alone, I have known them quietly take possession of a whole passage for a considerable distance. My advice to employers is, that they make a preliminary instruction, that no grate shall exceed *six* or at the very utmost *eight* inches in width. A church can be warmed, and that well, with narrow grates; occasionally a larger length of them may be required than if they were

[1] This thought might persuade our "correct" friends to spare at least a few of the gravestones in the old churches which they "restore."

broader, but it is the less evil of the two. The next thing is to place the lines of grates as much out of the way as is consistent with the proper distribution of the heat. When it can be done, they should be confined to side passages. In broad churches, however, it is almost necessary to admit them into the central passage, but the favourite trick of a single line up the centre should never be allowed. Besides being very conspicuous, it is dangerous from the insecure foot-hold which it gives just in the place where the traffic is greatest. The grates should always be placed along the sides of passages, close to the pews or to the wall, as the case may be. Lines of grates passing from north to south should never be allowed to cross the passages; where the pipes must do so the trenches should be paved over. No grates should be allowed in the sanctuary, for the carpets would cover them, and it is best not to have them in the choir. There is not usually any difficulty in warming the whole chancel from its aisles.

If the pipes in the trenches are not sufficient, they may be supplemented with coils in any places where they are tolerably out of sight. These may either be left in their native ugliness, which is great, or they may be enclosed in grated cases, which will always have to be specially designed, the ordinary ironmonger's patterns being below badness. The coil-cases should of course be kept quiet and inconspicuous, and not, as I have known them, be decked out in all kinds of "Gothic" magnificence, and made prominent from an idea that they were ornaments to the interior.

In large churches it is well to have two degrees of warming, the lesser of which should always include the chancel, and the side chapel, if there is one.

The flue system has the great advantage over the other two, that it does not disfigure the church, to which it is entirely external; and if it were equally efficient, it should for that very reason be always preferred to them. But I do not know any form of it which is thoroughly reliable. They are all difficult to regulate, and very apt to get out of order. I am not, however, without hope that this may be remedied, and then the only architectural problem connected with the warming will be the proper treatment of the tall chimney necessary in order to obtain a sufficient draught through the long horizontal flues in the floor—a small matter as compared with vanquishing a hydra of pipes and grates.

A sufficient warming power is not all that is required, there should also be in the church itself a reasonable faculty for retaining warmth. It happens that our pseudo-mediæval churches are by their very "correctness" exceedingly deficient in this respect.

One constant source of cold, and also of draughts, which are far worse than the mere lowering of temperature, is the bad fitting of modern church doors. Our ancestors, at a time when few of them possessed even window glass at home, were not likely to be particular about a draught or two more or less at church; and they were content simply to hang the door on a pair of iron hooks let into the stone jambs, as we now do farmyard gates. In spite of all our revivals, we have not yet been

fools enough to go back to this state of barbarism either in our houses or our stables; but at church the "correct" ones among us, true descendants of those who a century and a half ago were

"Proud to catch cold at a Venetian door,"

now piously insist that we shall do the same at a "First Pointed" one. If they like this, by all means let them practise it privately at home; but for the sake of ordinary mortals, "uncorrect" and liable to rheumatism, I plead that the church door ought to be made to fit, which can only be effected properly by providing it with a wooden door-case, as is always done in domestic work.

Even if it fit perfectly, which in practice none ever do, a door opening directly from the open air into the church must, by its use, be a source of continual and irregular admissions of cold air from without. Now, although fresh air is wanted, it should be admitted only by pre-arranged and *regulatable* channels; and all accidental introductions of it should be reduced as much as possible. The most perfect arrangement, both for practical working and for architectural magnificence, would be to make all doors from the church open into a large ante-church or entrance-hall, as at St Sophia, Constantinople, and other of the oldest Christian churches; and on a smaller scale in many of the English churches, built between the year 1660 and the invention of "correctness." But to do this properly implies a scale of expenditure which is very exceptional in modern church-building; we must therefore look for

some less costly means of excluding draughts.[1] A porch will do pretty well if it has double doors; but still better is the old-fashioned and dreadfully "uncorrect" internal lobby. By the use of this, the dignity of the entrance is better maintained than when there is an outer door to the porch; for the opening in the main wall—the real entrance to the building—holds the actual doors of the church, and not mere screen doors, as in the latter case. A lobby is not necessarily either ugly in itself or a disfigurement to a church. I do not remember any notably good English examples, and the more recent ones—for, in spite of its "uncorrectness," the bad fitting of modern doors has sometimes compelled its use—being generally designed in the "packing-case Gothic" style, are architecturally patterns of everything which is to be avoided; but in different parts of the Continent a good example may now and then be seen: there is a really fine one, of the sixteenth century, at the west entrance of the great church at Louvain.

The best practical models for lobbies are the double doors used in banks, and suchlike places of business, where it is customary to leave the outer door open during business hours, and a lighter inner door is provided to keep out the cold. From them we may imitate almost everything (including the spring-hinges), except

[1] The *narthex*—as it is affectedly called—of some modern churches, is generally nothing but a badly-managed porch, wanting both the architectural dignity and practical convenience of the Greek hall, to which the name properly belongs. It might, however, if its doors fitted well, be of some use in helping to keep the church warm.

the architectural detail. I would not place glass panels in the swing-doors, but in the sides of the lobby, unless it is lighted from above the outer door, for the lobby ought not to be dark inside, because in cold weather the outer door should be closed before the inner one is opened. In warm weather the outer doors might usually be left open. And as it is sometimes desirable to have the doorway entirely clear and unobstructed, the swing-doors should have some means for fastening them back.

A thick, heavy curtain is sufficient covering for small occasional doors. But though they are sometimes used, curtains are not good for the principal doors by which the congregation mostly enter the church: they are not sufficient protection from wind; for when the door is open they are liable to blow about; and if they are heavy enough to be any good at all, they are a great obstruction to the entrance.

Another great source of what I may call the *cooling power* in our modern churches is the absence of ceiling, which is common to nearly all of them. This has its origin in a mistaken interpretation of the sound, but greatly misunderstood, architectural maxim, that design should be based upon constructive exigencies, and not disguise or conceal them, a maxim which will be examined more fully in the proper place; here it is sufficient to point out, that although the carpentry of a roof is capable of artistic treatment, yet if any practical advantage is gained by the use of a ceiling, then the ceiling, not the roof, is the "constructive exigency," upon the

treatment of which the architect must exercise his skill and taste. As a matter of individual opinion, I myself think the comprehensive and severer forms of a ceiling more accordant with the quiet calm and solemn dignity which should characterise the interior of a church, than a busy confusion of naked timbers. I would use the ceiling, then, from æsthetic considerations alone, but there are strong utilitarian reasons in its favour.

The roof, of which in modern churches there is often a larger surface than of the walls, is a very thin partition between the air outside and inside the building, and even where its conducting power has been reduced by the use of felt, there is always a tendency quickly to assimilate the temperatures on either side of it, and consequently in winter the internal warmth is rapidly dissipated, and in summer there is but little protection from the external heat. The best and easiest remedy for this is to provide a *neutral* layer of air between the roof and the church; or in other words, to use a ceiling. Besides regulating the temperature, the ceiling is a great assistance in the ventilation. The space above it, or "false roof," as it is rather unmeaningly called, should communicate freely both with the external air and with the church, but in such a way as to be completely under control. Where there is a tower, it is a good plan to carry up it a ventilating flue from the adjacent roofs; and if gas is used in the church, there should be a ventilator in the ceiling over every pendant. The main pipes should also be the false roof, which should be of sufficient size, easily accessible, and not dark.

The ceiling may take many forms. By far the best is —with Mr Fergusson's leave—the stone vault, which is not only the most "monumental" in appearance, but also serves all the practical uses of a ceiling better than any other. For the highest class of buildings the later form of English vaulting, composed entirely of wrought stone, is a better type than the earlier rib-and-panel work. The rib-and-panel vault is, however, much less costly, and can be used with excellent effect; and I can see no reason why the panels should not be formed of some of the concretes which we are now able to procure, nor indeed why ceilings of the groined form—*i.e.*, with the side windows rising above the springing of the vault—should not be formed entirely of concrete, finished on the under side with plaster, and even decorated with plaster-work. This, properly treated, would be a very different affair from a sham stone vault made of wood or lath and plaster.

Vaulted ceilings cannot always be used, although they might be much oftener than they are. They are not in themselves very expensive, but they require more support than others, and consequently, except where they are low and of small span, they involve a considerable extra outlay in the walls and buttresses. Wooden ceilings require no special arrangement of the whole building to carry them, and in ordinary cases may be said not to cost anything; for, except where economy is pushed to its utmost limit, and the mere necessary framing of the roof is left visible without ornament of any kind, the price of the ceiling may generally be saved out

of the extra workmanship and additional material which, but for it, would be expended upon the roof itself. A wooden ceiling affords considerable scope for architectural treatment. I think the best general form is that of a polygonal "waggonhead" of five or seven sides. The wooden vault is, in spite of abundant mediæval precedent, not to be commended; it is an unnatural treatment of wood—even of oak, which affords the curved pieces required for the ribs, and doubly so of the straight-grained deal, which is now almost always used—it originated in the deliberate substitution of an inferior material in the completion of work designed for and partly executed in stone; when finished, the wood and stone were painted exactly alike, so that it is impossible from below to say where one begins and the other ends; in fact, the whole was intended to be taken for stone, and is as dishonest a sham as the stucco stone "orders" of modern Regent Street.[1]

[1] Many admirers of the works of the Middle Ages, unwilling to believe that anything mediæval is not admirable, not only excuse, but imitate wood vaulting and some other faults. For my own part, I am a complete sceptic as to the artistic purity of the Middle Ages. Honestly I believe, that if our ancestors did not make so much use of shams as men do nowadays, it was because they did not know how. I never, indeed, detected any of them in the capital offence of *graining*—they were no great admirers of bare oak—but they were certainly guilty of *marbling*, traces of which may often be found. Lest it should be said that the painting may be recent, I will cite an unmistakable case. I myself saw pieces of marbled chalk, forming part of the shrine of St Alban, taken out of a wall in which they had been built up for more than 300 years. I have not the book at hand for reference, but I think the process of marbling is described in the "Diversarum artium schedula" of the monk Theophilus. That the "old men" used their shams with better taste than is now done may be true, but that they had the wholesome horror of practical lies, which some attribute to them, and

Stone and wood are not the only allowable materials for ceilings. For instance, I do not know why plaster should not be employed. The fact that we always use it in our houses is of itself a *primâ facie* reason why it should be suitable for churches. All it wants is a proper treatment. It is one of the affectations of "correctness" to reject materials merely because they were not used in the thirteenth century, or because ignorant people have in recent times put them to improper uses. All materials are good to those who know how to use them, and all are bad to those who do not. Men who now make stone vaults of wood have no right to laugh at James Wyatt for making them of lath and plaster.

Large churches may be sufficiently ventilated from the ceiling alone, but smaller ones require in addition some means of admitting fresh air lower down. This can best be done by placing ventilators in some unconspicuous positions in the walls. In the sills of windows is a good place, if they are sufficiently high up; for the ventilators should always be above the heads of the congregation, in order to prevent draughts. It is a common and absurd practice to put ventilators into the windows themselves, the absurdity lying in the fact that the windows with the ventilators are often removed one after another to make way for painted glass, so that ultimately the church is left without any ventilation at all.

which I hope may be adopted into the art creed of the future, I cannot admit. They made great use of false jewels; and old inventories constantly record counterfeit cloth-of-gold, counterfeit "bandekyn," and indeed all kinds of counterfeits.

## *SECTION XXVI.*

### OF ALMS-BOXES.

ABOUT these there is but little to be said. There are two kinds, permanent and occasional. Of the first are the poor's-box, and that which is now often added to receive offerings for general church purposes. They should stand in the clear space west of the pews, where they can be seen by every one entering or leaving the church. But they ought not to be too near the doors, or they will be concealed by the crowd as the congregation is dispersing. In most cases the best place for them is against the two westermost pillars of the nave.

There is often a great affectation of security about modern alms-boxes; they are of oak, strapped in all directions with iron, and sometimes have a whole row of padlocks. The security is altogether imaginary; the straps are only fastened on with screws, and often the box itself is fixed to the wall by the same means, so that any man with a screw-driver might in three minutes, without violence or noise, either open the box, or detach it from its place, and walk off with it. Some old alms-boxes are really of very great strength; they are cut out of solid logs of timber, deeply fixed into the ground, and

have lids secured by ironwork, which is *not* at the command of every man with a screw-driver. Even these, however, are not perfectly safe; indeed, an absolutely burglar-proof box is only obtainable, if at all, at a very great cost. The best way to protect the alms-box from any systematic attempt at forcing, is never to allow its contents to accumulate for a sufficiently long period to become a temptation. A strong well-made oak box, well-fastened to its place by screws *inside* it, and having a good strong lock,[1] is secure against ordinary depredation, without iron straps or any nonsense of that kind. Some means should be taken to render impossible the abstraction of coin through the slit at the top by means of a piece of wax on the end of a whalebone—a common trick with small thieves. It may be prevented in various ways, the essence of all of which is to make a coin take a circuitous course in its descent from the slit to the bottom of the box.

Over each box should be a legible inscription, explaining its purpose, and if any text or motto is added besides, it ought to be in different and less conspicuous characters than the first. For occasional boxes a written card will suffice.

The poor's-box, if not also that for church expenses, should, I think, always be distinct and complete in itself; not only one compartment in a larger box, but a box with several divisions, each with its own slit and label, is often convenient where there are many minor objects being collected for. The regular alms-boxes should not

[1] Or two or three, if the custom of the place require it.

be diverted from their proper uses. When special collections are asked for, special boxes should be provided. These may be fastened with staples and padlocks to the church wall when they are wanted.

## *SECTION XXVII.*

### OF NOTICE BOARDS.

THESE, like the alms-boxes, must be where they are likely to be seen by people entering and leaving the church. If there is an antechurch they should be placed there, and such as contain permanent notices may even be placed in an open porch; but those on which are fixed papers with temporary notices ought to be in a more sheltered position—that is, in most cases, in the church itself.

Notice boards cannot be too simple. Attempts to give them an "ecclesiastical" character usually result only in making them horribly ugly. A plain rectangular board is the best; a simple moulding round the edge will do no harm, but "Gothic" tops, "Oxford" frames, and the like, with their chamfers, stops, and all other concomitant abominations, are without reservation to be condemned. Permanent inscriptions should be written with black paint upon light-coloured boards, in letters of simple and ordinary form. Black-letter is of course "correct," but to many people it is illegible, and I take it the object of setting up notices is that they may be read.[1] What is called *illuminating* is open to the same

[1] I do not say that the more complicated forms of lettering ought never to be used, only that they are unfit for everyday utilitarian purposes. In

objection, with this additional one that as generally practised it is in itself offensive from its crude forms and colouring. Boards intended for posting papers upon are, I think, best stained black, with a word or two in white at the top, indicating the general nature of their contents.

In *un*-"restored" churches, in the north of England, and perhaps elsewhere, there may occasionally be seen, set up in some conspicuous place, a frame containing moveable panels, upon which figures are painted. These are intended to show which verses of which of the metrical psalms are to be sung. The idea is an excellent one, and worthy of general imitation, for by it the unseemly breaks in the service, caused by "giving out"[1] the hymns, may be entirely avoided, and also the inconvenience which sometimes arises from the indistinct utterance of the giver out. So far, however, I only know of one modern church in which anything of the kind is used, and there it consists of nothing but some large cards hung upon nails driven into one of the joints of the masonry. This works perfectly well, and all it requires is to be put into a somewhat more formal shape. Let

inscriptions introduced in architectural decorations they are quite allowable, and also in commemorative and other inscriptions professedly addressed *ad clerum;* but those intended to be read by everybody should be in the characters taught at the national school.

[1] Even at its shortest this is objectionable; it is made much more so by the common practice of reading out a considerable portion of the hymn. In favour of this, it may be said that those who have failed to catch the number announced may recover it from the first line read out. There is, however, no such excuse for the custom which exists in some churches of reading out a text, or *motto* prefixed to each hymn.

three hooks be fixed at proper distances in any position which is at once easy to reach, and visible to all the congregation—in the wall, or in the rood-screen, or even in front of the pulpit. Conveniently near let there be a case containing wooden tablets pierced for suspension, and with large figures painted on both sides of them. With a set of fifteen tablets every number from 1 to 999 may be composed, and twelve only will reach up to 554 which is far in excess of the requirements of any well-regulated hymn-book. Above the hooks there should be a reversible board, with the word HYMN on one side, and PSALM on the other; the latter is not wanted for the ordinary psalms of the day, but will be found convenient for indicating special psalms.

## *SECTION XXVIII.*

### OF MONUMENTS AND INSCRIPTIONS.

THE essential quality of a monument is permanence, to obtain which two points ought to be observed. First, that the monument shall be itself neither perishable, nor of a sort calculated to provoke alteration or destruction; and secondly, that it shall be placed where it is least likely to be interfered with. Churches have always been looked upon as the most fitting places for monuments, and are, I believe, still so; although that statement may seem rather bold, when it is remembered that within the last few years many thousands of monuments have been turned out from English churches and destroyed. The fact is, that we are just now in a very exceptional state; the neglect and apathy of three centuries has produced a violent reaction; the guardians of our churches have changed their natural conservatism for an innovating zeal, which in its indiscretion amounts to fanaticism. This zeal, guided and led on by ignorant "correctness," has certainly made terrible havoc. What with the "restoration" of what is "Gothic," and the annihilation of what is not, a large portion of our birthright is already lost, but a truer appreciation of art and of history is even now arising; our losses will be mourned over, but a remnant will be saved. Then will

follow yet another period of change; old churches which have been "restored" must be *dis*restored, and such new ones as are worth it must have their "correct" arrangements altered, so as to make them practically convenient. After which, the natural order being resumed, our churches, the requirements of which are constant, whilst those of secular buildings are continually changing, will again become, as they ought to be, the proper and safest receptacles for those objects which we design to bequeath to posterity.

Nothing, I believe, can justify the deliberate destruction of the monuments of the dead, which are a sacred trust committed to each succeeding age for the benefit of those who come after; but there may, in individual cases, be excellent reasons for removing them from their original positions, or even, under extreme circumstances, for withdrawing them entirely from public view. Amongst these are their *obstructiveness*, where they interfere with the legitimate uses of the building in which they stand, their *indecency*, which may lie either in their designs, their inscriptions, or in the positions which they occupy, their *incongruousness*, and their intrinsic *ugliness*. These faults exist more or less in almost every monument which has been set up in England during the past two centuries, and moderns, who do not hesitate even to destroy old monuments because of them, must themselves avoid them, or they cannot hope that their works will be treated with more respect. It is to our interest then to make the monuments we set up suitable, but we ought to go further, and make them not only

appropriate and beautiful in themselves, but ornaments to the buildings in which they are placed. How well this can be done we may learn from our ancestors of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. How much, for instance, does the sanctuary of Westminster owe to the three tombs on its north side! that of St Albans to the chantries of Ramrydge and Wheathampsted, or that of Beverley to the beautiful Percy tomb!

Monuments may be broadly divided into two classes —namely, those which mark the site of interments, and those which do not. Up to the present time the former has been by far the most numerous class; but for the future, monuments in churches, with which alone we are now concerned, will belong almost entirely to the latter. There are some kinds of monuments which may be used in either class; but others are suitable for one only, as, for instance, flat floor slabs to the former, and mural tablets to the other.

A flat slab is the simplest means of marking a grave, and the one which is less than any likely to be offensive; for even if it be not in itself good, from its position it can scarcely become sufficiently conspicuous to be very objectionable. These gravestones vary from the simple flag, with a plainly-cut inscription, to elaborate designs in engraved brass, or inlaid with marble or other material. For the first it is principally necessary to select a good hard stone. Inscriptions are more durable incised than in relief; but there exist a good many seventeenth-century gravestones, covered with slightly raised ornament, which look very well, and it is pos-

sible that, in positions little exposed to be walked over, something of the same kind might properly be done now.

Seeing that some of our churches contain examples which are even now nearly as perfect as when they were placed there, five or six centuries ago, it may seem odd to allege want of durability as an objection against brasses. It is, however, one. The vast majority of those which once almost paved our churches have entirely perished. They suffer not so much from legitimate wear and tear as from theft of the metal. Now, if we desire permanence, we should be careful not to tempt the destruction of what we put up for the sake of the material. Large masses of metal, too weighty for private plunder, are safe in time of peace; but how many bronzes have been melted down to make guns! The golden shrines and frontals, the pride of our old abbeys, might even now have remained but for their material. And so it is with the tomb brasses: they, indeed, are even worse off than many other things; for the metal being often easily removable in small pieces, is at the mercy of every petty pilferer. On this ground alone I cannot recommend their use; in other respects they are exceedingly good.

Inlaid floor slabs are also perishable; the inlays or *tesseræ* become loosened and disappear. There are several old stones of this kind at Westminster Abbey; but all are more or less in a bad condition, and from one the mosaic has so entirely gone that its existence would not now be suspected but that one end of the slab

was built over in the fifteenth century, and has thus been preserved.

The sarcophagus, or altar-shaped monument, was in its origin an actual sepulchre, and continued to be used as such during many centuries; but in England during the Middle Ages this was by degrees discontinued, and at the time when the high tomb received its greatest development, the interment was as a rule in a vault below, or near it. The primitive arrangement is now so exceedingly exceptional that the sarcophagus has long ceased to suggest the presence of a body within it. I can therefore see no reason why this form of monument should not be used as a cenotaph. None lends itself better to architectural purposes, nor, if it be properly managed, will any harmonise better than it with the interior of a church. Raised tombs must of course be placed so as not to be in the way, or to encroach upon useful space. They may be in arched recesses in the walls, or sometimes simply against the walls, or against screens. One of the best and most effective treatments is to place the tomb in one of the side arches of the chancel, and make it and its surmounting canopy form a screen. This may also be done in an arch between the church and a side chapel. If a side chapel is, as it very properly may be, itself a monument, and if there is room enough, a raised tomb be placed in the middle of it. But this should never be done in the chancel, or the tomb will become too conspicuous an object in the church, and will injure the altar. The usual fourteenth-century position for a founder's tomb—in an arched recess on the

north side of the sanctuary—is in every respect an excellent one. It ought, however, to be provided for when the church is being built.

In England it has always been usual for the more costly altar-tomb to have on the top recumbent effigies of the deceased. Now, a word or two about effigies. In the first place, they ought to represent the persons commemorated as they were at least occasionally, and with serious purpose, during their lifetime, and not in masquerade costume, as is now the most general practice. The well-known excuse is, that our modern dress is incapable of artistic treatment. Truly, incapacity there is, but it is in the artists, not in the dress. Our present dress, indeed, is not the most suitable for representation in sculpture that ever existed, but at the least it is not so bad as fifteenth-century armour, or the ladies' dress of the latter part of Elizabeth's reign; yet with both of these satisfactory tomb effigies were made, and a good artist could do the same with our fashions. The fancy costumes are only recommended by sculptors because they can copy their art-treatment from the works of the "period," instead of thinking one out for themselves.

Of course some judgment must be used in the selection of the costume. The man would be a real genius who could give an artistic treatment to a "chimney-pot hat;" but it is not necessary to introduce a chimney-pot hat, and the ordinary Englishman's frock coat and trousers, with which it is associated, are perfectly manageable.

I do not wish to insist that every one should be represented in his ordinary everyday dress in which he habit-

ually walked about the streets, only in some dress which properly belonged to him. If there were any particular habit pertaining to a man's order or degree, or to any office or appointment held by him, by all means let him be represented in it. Let the clergy have their distinctive vestments, the peers their robes, the army and navy their respective uniforms, and so to every one; but let us cease to rig out our statesmen as Roman senators and our soldiers like stage warriors, or anybody else in clothes which do not belong to them.[1]

The attitude of an effigy on a tomb should be one of the most perfect quiet and repose. A statue in violent action is rarely pleasing, and in such a position it is doubly objectionable. It should not, however, represent a person as if dead, as in many Continental mediæval examples; or asleep, as in some modern English ones: a church is neither a place to go to sleep in nor to lay out a corpse in. It is impossible to improve upon the old English position—namely, the figure lying on the back, with the head slightly elevated and the hands raised as if in prayer. In most situations it is best that a tomb with a recumbent effigy should be surmounted by a canopy, which not only increases its importance, but, if well managed, may become a great ornament to the building in which it stands. Canopies may be either of stone or wood, and they may take an almost endless variety of forms.

[1] The statue of Dr Johnson at St Paul's Cathedral is perhaps the most ludicrous impropriety of this sort which has yet been produced. Would that we could hear the sensible old Doctor's own criticism of it, which I doubt not would be forcible, but brief.

The attitude of all monumental effigies in churches should be devotional. This almost necessarily excludes standing figures, which are also objectionable on other grounds. It is scarcely possible that a life-size standing statue, added to an interior with which it has no architectural connection or sympathy, can appear otherwise than an intrusion, which by its mere incongruousness becomes strikingly conspicuous. Now, a monument has no right to be conspicuous; it is placed in the church in order that the sacredness of the place may be a protection to it, and it should therefore not be treated as if the church had been built for its reception. Small portraits in almost any attitude, either in sculpture or painting, may with perfect propriety be introduced into the decoration either of the building itself or of any object in it which may be intended for a memorial; but they should be only of secondary importance, visible to those examining the church at leisure, but not obtruding themselves upon the notice of every worshipper. Busts or half figures may sometimes be used with success in circles or niches; but heads stuck simply on brackets, in the manner which now seems to be becoming usual at Westminster Abbey, are both unsuitable to churches and unpleasant objects in themselves.

The ponderous allegories of the "High Art" school scarcely need to be condemned. The "Gothic revival" and their own absurdity have so completely driven them out of popular favour, that it is now rather necessary to plead that those already in existence shall not be broken to pieces, than that no more shall be erected.

A simple inscription, placed where it is likely not to be disturbed, is a most suitable and durable memorial. Where such an inscription records an interment, it is fitly placed on the floor; but otherwise it is better on a wall, where it is not subject to the wear of constant traffic. I do not see why the inscription should not be cut on the wall itself, or, where that cannot be done, on a plain slab let into the wall. In either case a simple border is enough ornament, and even that is not necessary; but more may be added if it is wished to make the monument more costly.

This brings us to the subject of mural tablets. As we now see them, these, whether old or new "Classic" or "Gothic," are, with scarcely an exception, grievous disfigurements to the churches in which they stand. The best of them belong to the early part of the eighteenth century, since which time they have been getting worse and worse, till now they have culminated in the vulgar "Gothic" nondescript, decked out in all the tawdry glory of granite, alabaster, brass plate, and Venetian mosaic, and concerning whose designer we are at a loss whether to admire most his impudence in passing such a thing off as having anything in common with the style of the Middle Ages, or his ignorance in supposing it to be one whit better than the "tomb-tea-urn-and-tablecloth" style of article with which our fathers delighted to honour our grandfathers.

Unlike some other kinds of monument, a tablet is nothing in itself. Its whole essence lies in the inscription, which may commemorate either a deceased person

or an historical event. Now, an elaborate architectural composition surrounding a flat slab with nothing but a few letters upon it, can never be pleasing; it is like an empty picture-frame. This fault spoils by far the greater number of the older tablets remaining in our churches, some of which are, except for it, not merely unobjectionable, but positively good. In some of the earlier examples it is successfully avoided by placing a portrait or group of figures within the frame, and reducing the inscription to a subordinate position. The effect of this is often architecturally very good; but there is a too great absence of distinctively religious feeling to allow of our choosing it for general imitation.[1] It may be suggested, that in place of the personal representations, the frame might be filled up with a sculpture or painting of some sacred subject. But this, again, would be wrong; for the very *raison d'être* of the tablet is, that it may commemorate some person, and to design the whole without any reference to him, except by an inscription occupying a very secondary position, would be absurd. In saying this, I wish not to be misunderstood. I speak only of objects set up simply and solely as tributes of respect or affection to individuals, and which, if not there, would neither be missed nor wished for. I hold that, under proper restrictions, such should not be excluded from churches. But besides these there is another class: an altar, a font, a pulpit, a screen, a

[1] Tablets of this kind, or even life-size standing statues, might, I think, without offence, be set up in an ante-church or entrance-hall, where there is one.

reredos, or almost anything in the church may become an appropriate memorial; or a work of art, especially a picture, may most suitably be presented for the double purpose of adorning the church and commemorating a departed friend. In all such cases, the first use is the more important; and it is our duty to prevent the second from jarring with it by becoming unduly prominent.

Of wall tablets it may be laid down as a rule, that they should be made up of an inscription surrounded by a border, not of a frame enclosing an inscription. There are a few very pretty examples of this treatment to be seen at Westminster Abbey, and here and there in other churches. They are of the last century, and are small rectangular slabs of white unpolished marble with rather broad margins, marked out by a few delicate mouldings, and enriched with running foliage in very slight relief. There is generally a little *Roman* affectation about them, which need not now be imitated; but in other respects they are admirable models.

Any good hard stone of uniform colour is suitable for a tablet; it need not be marble, although there is no doubt that unpolished white marble is the very best material which can be chosen. White marble polished is one of the most unpleasant things to look upon which can be imagined; but unpolished, it soon assumes a most beautiful soft tone. The common New Road tickets, which offend our eyes in nearly all the older London churches, would be almost unobjectionable if they were not polished; and some of them quite so if,

besides, they were deprived of their black mounts. The "correct" alabaster is altogether a mistake; an inscription should never be put on a material of variegated colour, or the letters will become confused with the natural markings. Brass plates are, in spite of mediæval precedent, also objectionable, both from their liability to be stolen, and because a flat surface of polished metal is very ugly when brought prominently into view, as it necessarily must be by being fixed against a wall.

As I have just said, almost any object of church furniture or decoration may become a monument. Any such should of course have proper inscriptions; but they should be modestly introduced, not obtrusively advanced into the most conspicuous places. We do not want, when looking towards a preacher, to be met by a staring placard on the front panel of the pulpit announcing that the said pulpit was erected to the memory of the late "Rev. John Smith, vicar of this parish;" but if we approach nearer on purpose to examine the pulpit, we are well pleased to find such an inscription. The inscriptions ought to be placed upon the commemorative object itself in such a manner that they cannot easily be removed without either materially altering or disfiguring it. They are so not only more likely to be permanent, but look vastly better than brass plates and the like, stuck on like temporary labels, out of all harmony with their surroundings.

Of inscriptions other than commemorative very little need be said. The Lord's Prayer and the Creed, the

tables of the old Law and of prohibited degrees, originally hung up in churches for didactic purposes, are not needed in these days of cheap Prayer-books. But there is no positive objection to their being set up, if any one wishes to do so. They ought, however, to be placed in the public part of the church,[1] and not over the altar, where no one can read them except the clergy, who are not likely to require to be instructed in the words of them. The texts, which it is now the fashion to put on the walls of churches, generally contrive to be very ugly, but that is only due to the way in which they are treated. Let such a text be written on the wall in a natural and readable character, surrounded by a painted border, or frame, if you like, but not painted on a flapping ribbon, or on a thing that looks like a flash of lightning Gothecised. If inscriptions were well selected and tastefully executed, I think we might with advantage use far more of them than we do. They need not be only texts of Scripture, indeed it is best that they should not be, or at least should not be from familiar passages, because such are not likely to fix the attention. They should be short pithy sentences, either in verse or prose, generally addressed to the reader, and calculated not so much to give him information as to suggest to him edifying subjects for meditation.

[1] As, indeed, the older examples are nearly always found to be.

## *SECTION XXIX.*

### OF ARCHITECTURE, AND OF THE FUNCTION OF THE ARCHITECT.

AT no time have there ever been so many architects as at the present, and there has scarcely ever been less practice of architecture. Architects abound; every town in England has numbers of them, yet I doubt whether there are fifty who ever did anything worthy of the name of architecture. Any man worth a brass plate and a door to put it on may dub himself architect, and a very large number of surveyors, auctioneers, house-agents, upholsterers, &c., with a sprinkling of bankrupt builders and retired clerks of works, find it to their interest to do so. And such is the ignorance of the employing public, that any man with plenty of impudence and what are called "business habits," although entirely wanting both natural talent and artistic education, may obtain employment as an architect, and even by luck may become to be regarded as one of the "leaders of the profession."[1] These

[1] The pernicious system of public competitions has done much to develop this class of architect. The time has long passed when real architects of standing would enter an open competition, except under very unusual circumstances; and the younger men, who might be tempted to do so, can rarely afford it. Competition-getting is now a distinct trade, and where a competition is not, as it often is, simply a cloak for a job, the chances are that the prize will be taken not by the author of the best design, but by the most unscrupulous touter, who, moreover, generally exhibits not his

men are not architects—not even *bad* architects. There are bad architects, but a bad architect *is* an architect. The aimless spreading over of their buildings with quasi-architectural forms no more makes men architects than the rattling on the keys of a pianoforte by a man who does not know one note from another makes him a musician. Such a man would not be called a *bad* musician; nor are the other architects, although some of them are doubtless very worthy men, and very useful in their proper spheres.

Mr John Smith, F.R.I.B.A.,[1] of Tee Square Court, E.C., may be an excellent authority on "ancient lights" and the requirements of the London Building Act; and Mr Jones, A.R.I.B.A., of Exeter, may have had much experience in the valuation of dilapidations, besides having given particular attention to the structure and arrangement of cowhouses. But Messrs Smith and Jones have not, therefore, any claim to the name of architect, more than a sign-writer has to membership of the Royal Academy of Arts; and they could only obtain it at a time when public taste is degraded to the lowest depth, when bad and good mean only cheap and costly, and when an architect is looked upon only as a person engaged to bully a builder, and to take care that he performs everything which is contained in his contract.

There is a very large class of buildings—assize courts,

own work, but that of an ill-paid hack. The lamentable waste of money and opportunities in our great modern town-halls shows how little competitions avail for obtaining good designs.

[1] It is observable that the parade of these imposing initials increases in inverse ratio to their exhibitors' artistic ability.

railway stations, workhouses, and the like[1]—which are judged solely by their fitness for their purposes, and in which æsthetic qualities are not looked for; with these Smith or Jones might sometimes produce very creditable results, if they did not spoil them, and manifest their own incapacity by overlaying them with a lot of pseudo-architecture, which serves no purpose but that of wasting the employers' money, and making both them and their buildings ridiculous. But at their best, and under the most favourable circumstances, buildings whose merits are purely utilitarian can no more be classed with works of true architecture than a *Times'* city article with one of Shakespeare's tragedies. I suppose there are prosaic men who hold that nothing more is required of a building than that it should be well planned and well built. It is very easy to say, as I believe some prig has said, that that is the best church which holds most worshippers: the same man would, I suppose, tell us that that is the best painting which will longest bear exposure uninjured, and that that is the best garden which produces most cabbages. But it will not generally be denied that a church—and as church-building is our subject we need not extend our inquiries further—ought to be something

[1] I do not mean, of course, that these or any buildings *ought* to be without architectural merit, but simply that they are *judged* irrespectively of it. A building may be practically a very convenient courthouse, though it be architecturally execrable, and that building would rightly be called a good courthouse. And a church may in the same way serve all the practical purposes of a church admirably, and yet be as ugly as the other; but the church would *not* be properly described as a good church, because æsthetic beauty is essential to a good church, and is not to a good courthouse.

better than a substantial shed, or in other words, it ought to be a work of architecture, as indeed most modern churches are, at least in intention.

It is particularly unfortunate that now, when the building of churches, and the desire to make them more fit for their sacred uses, is commoner than it has been for centuries, public taste in matters architectural is so degraded. Or rather I should say the taste does not exist; for it is not that men prefer what is bad—they are, I believe, for the most part absolutely indifferent to good or bad, and derive no real pleasure from the one nor pain from the other. There is, indeed, very common a sort of knowledge, or rather half knowledge, which is worse than total ignorance; but it is archæological, not æsthetic, and deals not with *art*, but with *style*. The consequences have been most disastrous. Where there is no taste, of course no discrimination and no criticism; so that church authorities, with the best intentions, often entrust their buildings to ignorants, who, after rendering them hideous, are praised in exact proportion to the outlay which they have caused. Hundreds of our old churches have been destroyed by the process which, with an irony trebly bitter by its unconciousness, is called *restoration;* whilst all over the country we find new churches whose pretension serves only to make their worthlessness the more conspicuous. Yet, forsooth, these things have been belauded by bishops and puffed in the newspapers. And if, as sometimes happens with respect to an old building, some man who really values it ventures to protest against the Vandalism which is being committed,

he is exposed to all sorts of ridicule and abuse: if an architect, he is accused of interested motives; if a clergyman—it is generally one of the two—he is probably dubbed either a Puritan or a Puseyite, according as the one or the other happens to be most objectionable in the eyes of his opponents.

I am far from saying that all our modern churches are absolutely and irretrievably bad. On the whole, they are a very great deal better than any other class of buildings. Of secular buildings not one in five hundred deserves the slightest notice for its artistic qualities; but of churches, at least a fourth have something which we can respect, though there are few which can be entirely commended. How few modern buildings of any sort are there which men are tempted to visit and revisit simply for the sake of their beauty, as one often does the old![1] They may almost be counted on the fingers. The public are really as much to blame for this as the architects. If men would either abstain from criticism, or criticise intelligently, things might be better; but now any fool will print and be read, and works are pompously praised or blamed not for their merits, but according as they conform or not to this or that particular style, or according to the critic's personal feelings towards their author;[2] whilst the vast number of ordinary newspaper writers, knowing nothing of either styles or authors, are

[1] The chief of them is the Westminster Palace, which it is the fashion to revile, and which the authorities seem to be doing their utmost to spoil.

[2] Witness the many columns of nonsense which have appeared in the *Times* newspaper on the subject of the new law courts.

fain to take refuge in universal eulogy. By such criticism good architects, bad architects, and no architects, are indiscriminately confounded, and the last by degrees brought to believe that they are not humbugs, whilst so far from being improved, public taste is altogether destroyed, and the general condition of architecture, instead of being elevated, is almost prevented from rising. The majority of the profession are, and indeed must be, men of little creative power, but not unapt to take up ideas suggested to them. Such men will keep level with the public taste, if there is one, and, though they can never do anything great, they may by wholesome criticism be prevented from doing anything very offensive. As things now are, they are entirely lost. They either subside altogether into the no-architect class, or, dazzled by certain brilliant examples of vulgarity, become feeble imitators of the most objectionable section of the bad architects.

It can scarcely be a matter of surprise that some thoughtful men, failing to find in works, which are continually being put forward, and unhesitatingly accepted as architectural, any of those ennobling qualities which should characterise a true work of art, have refused to allow architecture any place amongst the Fine Arts. But the verdict is unsound. If the incapacity of its professors is to make an art no art, then it must follow that sculpture is not an art, for, bad as is the present state of architecture, it cannot be disputed that we have amongst us more good architects than good sculptors.

Architecture *is* a fine art, and no one able to distinguish real architecture from false will deny it. Indeed, in one respect, architecture may even claim a superiority over painting and sculpture, for, like music, it is entirely the product of the human mind, and not necessarily imitative as are they. Architecture is, in fact, visible music,[1] as painting and sculpture are visible poetry. Nay, further, it is to some extent permanent music. A man in one of our old churches, if it be a good one—for of old there were good and bad as now, but the proportions were different—and if it be not destroyed by "restoration," may still receive the impressions which the artist four centuries or more ago meant that he should receive, and may enjoy the subtle beauties of the composition, even in spite of the many injuries from fanaticism and neglect, and from the incongruous interpolations of modern barbarism; and if, as is the common case, the church is the work of many consecutive generations, he may mark how each in his turn managed his alterations, so that, far from being discords, they added new harmonies to the concert.

I believe each of the Fine Arts has a utilitarian aspect, although in some of them it is not very marked. But in architecture it is essential; for good arrangement and construction are as necessary as æsthetic beauty, and no building can be called a perfect work of architecture

[1] I know this illustration is hackneyed, but its aptness is not disputed, I therefore use it without apology, for the sake of showing how far it is applicable to what now commonly passes for architecture.

which does not combine them all. The plan and arrangements of churches we have already discussed at length in the foregoing sections, and construction as such is outside our present subject; it therefore remains for us to inquire how the third necessary quality—that of æsthetic beauty—may be obtained.

Construction does not become architecture simply by the addition of ornament, else would our quacks and competition-getters be truly great architects, for their natural instinct is to hide their incapacity under a sepia-cloud of "enrichment." A great authority has indeed told us that architecture is a fine art only so far as it affords opportunities for the display and combination of the arts of painting and sculpture. But, with deference, I protest against a doctrine which can but encourage the far too common notion that architecture is simply a matter of details, and so help to retard the growth of a noble school amongst us. And, further, I maintain that architecture is an art independently of any aid it may receive from painting and sculpture. Are our old Cistercian churches, from which painting and sculpture were rigorously excluded, less works of art than the Benedictine and secular churches in which they were lavishly employed? Are the choir of Rievaulx and that grand wreck at Byland, in which there appear scarcely a turf of foliage and not a vestige of animal form, are these less works of art than Westminster Abbey or Lincoln Cathedral? Surely not. Splendid as are these latter in their profuse gorgeousness,

there is a classic beauty and simple perfection about the others which have never been surpassed. In the designer of the choir of Lincoln we venerate the mighty power which could control and blend in a harmonious whole a profusion of riches, one-tenth part of which would be beyond the management of any modern architect; but at Byland our admiration is equally excited at the skill which could produce such a wonderful result from such simple materials.

This low view of architecture is based upon the false axiom that no form can be truly beautiful except it resemble something to be found in organic nature. The inimitable perfection of nature's works none will dispute. But is *every* form of beauty exhausted therein? Can man not add anything to it? Surely man can produce beautiful forms, and in the power of doing so lies the art of architecture. The true architect so orders the necessities of arrangement and construction, as to compel them into beautiful forms, entirely irrespective of any natural form which we may use by way of ornament. Much he will learn from nature; it is his only school; but it is the spirit, not the letter, which he will follow, and he must study not only the external shapes of natural objects, but the nature of the materials which he uses, and of the laws of mechanics. This man-made beauty is indeed at best far inferior to nature's beauty; but it is suited to human means and to human requirements, and by so much as the creative faculty exceeds in nobility the merely imitative, by just so much does it exceed man's miserable copies of nature's beauty.

It is, then, the taste of the designer which elevates construction to the rank of architecture. This taste will show itself in the most trivial and commonplace subjects, but increases in importance as the subject becomes more monumental, and consequently churches, which of all buildings should be the most monumental, give the greatest opportunities for its exercise. A finished church should be as complete and perfect a work of art as a poem or a painting. The practical requirements of the building are but the incidents of the story, and must be severally treated according to their relative dignity. Let that which is noble have its due importance, and that which, though necessary, has but an humble function to perform be modestly treated and in harmony with the rest. Let not your altar be mean and your stove conspicuous, your notice-board be obtrusive and your pulpit invisible, but in everything let there be a due order.

"Denique sit quidvis simplex duntaxat et unum."

How far do our modern works meet these requirements? Some do so fairly well, but they are few, generally not expensive, and therefore very little noticed, unless indeed they happen to be the work of architects who are in fashion, in which case they are praised as a matter of course. But let us visit in imagination a popular modern church, or what is too often much the same thing, a "restored" old one of the more pretentious sort, and what shall we find? Let us go to the famous St Simeon's, over which a score of newspaper critics have poured forth their nauseous

torrent of cant about "graceful" this and "gemlike" that, the "glories of the Middle Ages," and all the rest of it. St Simeon's, which cost perhaps £25,000, and will hold, without accommodating, 700 worshippers, and which is on all sides acknowledged to be Mr Flick's masterpiece. We have spoken of the harmony in the old church, what is the music like at St Simeon's? I fear very much like that traditional Dutch chorus in which every man played his favourite tune on the instrument most to his liking. Mr Flick leads off with, it may be, an original composition, or it may be a more or less judicious selection from his library and note-books. Then start many carvers, "foliage hands," and "figure hands," who follow each his own devices, on caps, corbels, and other things "left for carving," and fill up the niches and other vacant spaces with figures and "subjects" of their own choosing. Messrs Stencil & Daub, "ecclesiastical decorators," perform astounding feats on the walls and roofs, whilst Mr Twister, the eminent "mediæval metal worker," executes marvellous flourishes on gas lamps and altar-rails. Nor are the glass painters behindhand; here one bellows "God save the Queen" on a "Prince Consort memorial," mostly pink and blue; there one of a newer school chants a *Te Deum*, all in green and yellow. On one side a worthy churchwarden feebly sounds the Jews' harp in a medley of subjects from the Old Testament, whilst on the other the squire of the parish blows his own trumpet with a lot of crudely-coloured heraldry, most likely from the Apocrypha. And so on, all through the windows, each

trying to outroar the rest. This is surely bad enough, but the chorus is yet far from complete, for even the very pavement is made a vehicle for loudness, and the smallest and most insignificant objects assert their right to add to the din, whilst, regardless of every one's feelings, the "warming engineer" drives his horrible organ-grind of pipes and gratings throughout the whole. Then the squire's wife executes a (very) brilliant *fantasia* on the altar frontal, arranged by the famous Mrs Berlin Baby-linen of Regent Street, whose taste in such matters is so well known, whilst, simultaneously, the "ladies of the parish" perform a number of others equally brilliant, but each in a different key, on the kneeling mats, and hangings for the pulpit, and sedilia, and the like. And last, but by no means least, Messrs Snip & Co., ecclesiastical tailors, supply diluted thunder, in the shape of carpets and curtains.[1]

Truly, this is very striking music, and so is the wauling of cats, and it is difficult to say which of the two is the more pleasing. But St Simeon's is an "exceedingly handsome church," and is "very much admired." The least, therefore, which we can do, is to inquire what is wrong with it. Of most of the single parts in the concert, we shall speak in detail further on; we will now suppose that each of them is good in itself—which, as St Simeon's

[1] It is indeed fortunate for the church if these are all they contribute; for, according to their own advertisements, these valorous tailors are each of them equal to nine men at least, and are prepared to take any or every part in the concert, from that of Mr Flick downwards.

is no real church, but the type of a class, we have a perfect right to do, although in practice it seldom, if ever, is so. Yet will the music be no better, for be the tones of an organ never so sweet, unless they are combined with skill, their union will only produce noise. What a church wants is *system* and *unity*. The architect's business is first to compose the piece, and then to conduct its performance. It is not necessary that he should play every part himself, but he should know enough about it to give the score, and see that it is properly worked out, and nothing whatever should be introduced without his sanction and supervision. At least half of the discords in our churches are introduced after the work of the architect is supposed to be finished, and thus it often happens that work, which is really good so far as it goes, is totally ruined in effect. The common notion seems to be that the architect's work ceases when his church is consecrated, at which time it is seldom fully finished and scarcely ever complete in its decorations. And even though a church has been once really finished, it cannot often pass through very many years without alterations or additions of some sort or other, which should not be left to chance or to the guidance of amateurs, who, though they may have excellent taste, have not experience which will enable them to foresee the æsthetic consequences of the works they propose. The task of the architect is never finished so long as work of any kind has to be done in the church ; if the work outlast the architect, let

it be put into the hands of another at least as good, and after him another, and so on. So it was that our ancient churches grew to be what they are, and so it must be again, if ever we are to rival them.

## *SECTION XXX.*

### OF STYLE.

JUDGING from the amount of quarrelling which has been going on for many years about this, one might imagine it to be the most vital subject connected with architecture. But really it is one of comparatively little importance, and it is a pity that so much time and temper have been wasted about it. Styles of architecture are but the art languages in which architects express themselves, and are not of the essence of art itself. One style may indeed be better than another, just as one spoken language is more expressive than another, but in any of them good work may be done. Europe has never seen a worse style than the Palladian, but that does not prevent the cupola of St Paul's from being one of the finest works of architecture which we possess. To condemn a work simply because it does not accord with the critic's preconceived notions about style, is as absurd as to deny the merit of Molière's comedies, because they are written in French.

The idea that only one style ought to be tolerated is very general at the present time, but there is great diversity of opinion as to which that style should be; and one particularly narrow-minded sect, who know not

what they ask for, are continually clamouring for the invention of a new style. Time was when we had a national style, and then all architects worked in it naturally, just as our poets naturally write in the national language; but the national style died out—at least as regards high-class works, though almost to the present time it has continued to exist in a sort of vernacular fashion—and for three centuries we have been without one, and architects, led either by preference or by accidental circumstances, have borrowed sometimes from one source and sometimes from another. We have now therefore not one, but many styles, and the style in which each man has been educated, or which by special study he has made his own, is to him his native style, in which he will naturally express himself, and which, if he be worth anything, he will by his works enrich and advance. Some of these styles are, of course, better than others, but each man will probably work best in his own, and, if they be rationally and naturally used, they may possibly be gradually drawn together until they become one. But if ever again we are to have a national style we shall not get it for squalling. We must wait patiently until it develops of itself. A man can no more invent a new style than he can invent a new language.

It will be far more profitable if, instead of trying to force any one style, old or new, into general acceptance, we endeavour carefully to search out what general qualities should belong to a perfect style, and then by these qualities test the styles now in use, with a view to their correction and improvement by the elimination of what

is false, and the introduction of what is wanting. For style is not a Procrustean bed which all artists must be lopped down to fit. The laws of styles are good for forming the minds and directing the ideas of beginners, but no real artist is bound by them. Nothing great can ever come of rules and canons. What is called correctness of style can by itself no more make a man an architect than good grammar can make him an orator, regular versification a poet, or etiquette books a gentleman. In all these cases the over-scrupulous attention to rule is a pretty certain indication of the absence of essential qualities. A master in art gives new laws to his style, and by so doing contributes to that gradual change and development which are the life of a true school. Thus, therefore, I justify the statement that the choice of style is not a matter of much importance, for whatever existing style a school may select for present use, if they be men of true art-instinct and power, and if they work in a rational and not in a pedantic spirit, they must ultimately mould it into a respectable or even an excellent form.

Architecture has two kinds of laws, the natural and the conventional. The first are absolute and immutable. They are those imposed by the necessities of construction, the properties of materials, and the like. These can never be neglected with impunity, and the systematic ignoring of any of them is by itself sufficient to condemn any artist or style. The second sort of laws are arbitrary, and subject to change. These are formulas and canons based originally upon experience, which have by

degrees come to have the force of laws to all who are not superior to them, but it is not just to blame an artist for neglecting any of them, provided that he does so with success.

In the earlier part of the present century, the natural laws of architecture were entirely lost sight of, and, consequently, the art was sunk so low that it can scarcely be said to have existed at all. But by the writings and example of the late Augustus Welby Pugin, and of those who immediately followed him, "true principles," as they were called, were so powerfully brought into notice, that their importance is now generally recognised; indeed, in some respects the tendency is rather to exaggerate than to neglect them. The first natural law is that design should recognise and be based upon construction, not disguise or conceal it. Arguing from this, some contend that all construction, and even all material, should be left visible; they forbid us to plaster our walls, paint our furniture, or ceil our churches, because thereby we hide the constructional stone and wood, and cut off from view the framing of the roof. But herein lies a misunderstanding of the rule. If, as is often the case, walls are the better for being plastered, or, as is nearly always the case, an apartment is the better for being ceiled, then the plaster and the ceiling are just as much parts of the construction as the walls and the roof are, and just as much require a suitable and legitimate treatment in the design. It is required not that nothing shall be covered, but that nothing shall be falsified. The design need not

disclose everything, but it must tell no lies. It must not give the impression that certain construction is there which is not. Let the ceiling, whatever be its material, be evidently a ceiling, and not an imitation of a roof; let the plastering be evidently a coating of the walls, and not ruled with joints to look like ashlar, or formed into pilasters and arcades in imitation of stone construction.[1] So far from its being always necessary to expose construction naked to view, it rarely happens but that in interiors there is something which is best covered—not concealed, but veiled, as the anatomy of the body is by the skin. The meaning of this rule is that a design should be an artistic treatment of the essential features of the subject, and not, as it often is, in what are called the "classic" styles, a merely academic production, in which nothing but outward effect has been studied, and to which the practical arrangements of the building have to be accommodated as best they can. If an arch or a window is wanted in any position, let it be accepted as part of the design, and treated accordingly, not looked upon as a nuisance, which interferes with the regularity of the composition, and which, if possible, must be kept out of sight. Cold architectural abstractions may give pleasure to the pedant, but the naturally-designed building appeals to all, except, indeed, to the essentially vulgar-minded; it pleases, though often men know not why; such a building has itself a

[1] If it is thought desirable to vary the surface of the plaster, it may be moulded or modelled in a manner suitable to its nature.

soul, and lives with its builders, and after them, with each generation of occupants.

It must not, however, be concluded that irregularity is necessary to true architecture, nor even that æsthetic must always give way to practical considerations. The two must always go hand in hand, and in nothing is the judgment of the architect more strongly shown than in the just balancing of their respective influences. The architecture of a building should correspond in character with its uses. In an ordinary dwelling-house comfort and cheerfulness are all-important, whilst stateliness is of no moment; the convenience of the individual rooms, and of their position with respect to one another, must therefore first be considered, and the general design in every way subordinated to them. But in a church, solemnity and unity of æsthetic purpose are most desirable qualities, and to obtain them, regularity of disposition and simplicity of design are necessary. In a word, the church is a *monumental* building, and the house is not. In neither of them should either practical or æsthetic considerations be ignored, but the former should give the architectural tone to one, and the latter to the other.[1]

[1] There is no real difference between ecclesiastical and secular styles, beyond that which is indicated in the text. In the best periods it will always be found, that however different in appearance the various classes of buildings may be, the same regulating laws underlie all the designs. To insist, as is often now done, that "true principles" ought to be adhered to in ecclesiastical work, whilst in secular shams and deceptions are allowable, is, as an eminent living architect has quaintly told us, like flogging a child for telling lies on Sunday.

The doctrine that the treatment of each material should be in accordance with its physical qualities is now pretty generally accepted, but its beneficial influence is much counteracted by a blind adherence to mediæval forms. It is assumed that all "old work," of whatever description, is done upon "true principles," and that to copy it cannot be wrong. The unsoundness of the first of these assumptions I shall endeavour to point out presently, the second must of course fall with it; but even granting that the former were sound, modern work is done under such very different conditions from the old, that forms, which were then perfectly legitimate and right, are now often altogether false and unnatural.

It is manifestly impossible, in a short essay like this, to examine by itself the arbitrary code of each of the many styles now in use, we must therefore confine ourselves to a few points, selecting those which seem to be most widely applicable. If we carefully study our modern ecclesiastical buildings, I mean, of course, those which have been designed by architects, for it is as impossible, as it would be unprofitable, to make any analysis of the works of the no architects. I think it will be found that nearly every want of success may be traced to one or other of two causes—viz., pedantry and vulgarity.

Pedantry, being not only the earlier in time, but in every way the more respectable fault, claims our first attention. It is indeed with much reluctance that one finds one's self compelled to condemn, as a fault, that which

is a chief characteristic of some of the very best works of modern architecture. The earlier workers in the "Gothic revival" were pedants to the backbone, and yet, not to name men still amongst us, who can withhold his respect and admiration from such true architects as Augustus Welby Pugin and R. C. Carpenter. These men were right in their pedantry; they were learning the alphabet of the art; and the fault is ours, if, after they have taught it to us, we can make no better use of it than to go on endlessly repeating it.

The opinion still generally held, even by men of real taste, is, that in each building it is necessary to adopt some particular "period," as they call it, and conform to it in every, even the minutest, particular. They condemn a feature not because it is ugly or unsuitable, but because it is too "early" or too "late," too French or too English, or because it is an anachronism. My good critics, what can be a greater anachronism than a church of the thirteenth century built in the nineteenth? We must study the old churches indeed, but not copy them, and as for "period," unless we can name a single date at which all excellences were combined, it must follow that we are losers by binding ourselves down to any. It happens that the mediæval styles, both at home and abroad, developed, in some respects, very much more rapidly than they did in others. In masonry, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, a degree of perfection was reached, which leaves nothing to be desired on the score of truthfulness of treatment; later periods had more of grace and refinement, but they were often

obtained by the sacrifice of qualities which on occasions and for certain purposes it is very desirable to retain. Works of the thirteenth century may, therefore, be studied, not only as those of every period may for the sake of their intrinsic merits as works of art, but, with respect to their masonry, as good models of style. With woodwork, however, the case is far different; for two centuries after masonry had been perfected, and whilst in England it was changing only from one form of excellence to another,[1] woodwork was only very gradually emerging from a state of the rudest barbarism. The carpentry was clumsy and unscientific, and depended for stability on the great quantity and huge scantlings of its timbers. And joiners' work can scarcely be said to have existed till about the beginning of the fifteenth century. The few remaining early examples, which some men seem never tired of calling upon us to

[1] We in England were more fortunate than our French and German neighbours; and, by a few well-timed reforms, succeeded in correcting the natural tendency which all fully-developed styles have to "run to seed;" and so kept our architecture tolerably pure. Our most critical period was the latest form of lancet; but the "geometrical" reform corrected that. Then the geometrical style, in which the Germans stuck, and which, in their hands, became the most wire-drawn and degraded of all the Gothic styles, had in England no time to decay before it was replaced by the "flowing." This, in turn, was saved from the debasement which awaited it in France, by the wholesome restraint of the "perpendicular" reform. It must, I think, be admitted that in France and Germany the "renaissance" style was at first an improvement on those which it displaced. But in England, when we look at the latest works of the pure Gothic, and then note what grand works were done in even such a wretched bastard style as our Elizabethan, we are tempted to think that, but for this unfortunate foreign influence, we should shortly have developed a style which would have eclipsed everything preceding it.

fall down and worship, do not even deserve the name of carpentry; they are made up of planks and logs grossly formed and put together, without any recognition of the nature or capabilities of the wood. And even the highly-finished, and in many respects, admirable works of the fourteenth century, such as the choir stalls at Winchester and Ely, are most archaic in their treatment of the material, and altogether unfit to be regarded as finished models of style. Those pillars, with their caps, their bands, and their bases; those arches and gables, with their deeply undercut mouldings and tracery, what have they to do with a tough and fibrous material like oak? They are all stone forms, and originate in the necessities of construction with small pieces of nonfibrous substance. It was not until the fifteenth century that our English woodworkers succeeded in entirely shaking off the masons' influence, and began thoroughly to understand and respect the nature of the material in which they worked. They then produced a style, which, though it has never yet received all the refinement of which it appears to be capable, is certainly amongst the best that the world has ever seen.

Stone and wood being the materials whose treatment has the greatest influence on architectural style, and they being found to differ so widely in the dates of their art-history, it is unnecessary to examine that of other materials in order to show the unreasonableness of fixing any single period as the one which is in all things to be followed. If we must choose a period, I have little hesitation in saying that, instead of the now fashionable

"thirteenth century," it ought to be that of the much-reviled "perpendicular." For the "perpendicular" style, though it does not monopolise every good quality, certainly combines a larger number than any other; besides being, of all the ancient styles, the most suitable to the requirements of the present day.

But another, and even more powerful reason against the strict adherence to any past style, is the great difference between some of our most common building materials and those formerly in use. As we are now speaking only of ecclesiastical architecture, we may leave out iron construction from the argument, because its use in any form or quantity sufficient to influence the style of the work, is inadmissible into monumental buildings, at least until it has passed a long probation, and assumed something like a definite architectural character in buildings of a less important class. But the now general use of deal for all ordinary building purposes instead of oak, which was almost always used in the Middle Ages, calls for a corresponding modification of the architectural treatment. Ever since the revival of the Gothic styles, the use of oak has been looked upon as "correct," and consequently, where it could be afforded, it has nearly always been exclusively used. But this is a mere affectation. For furniture, and the more elaborate works of joinery, a harder and tougher wood than deal is certainly desirable; oak is very suitable, but there are other woods equally so, and there is no reason why they should not sometimes be used with such treatment as their nature requires. For

many purposes of carpentry, however, deal is really better than oak, and I would use it by preference, even in buildings of the highest class. It is quite capable of good architectural treatment. But to copy, as is often done, in soft, straight-grained deal, designs and methods of construction invented for, and only suitable to, a tough and sometimes curved timber like oak, is unreasonable and absurd.[1]

Further arguments leading to the same conclusion may be derived from the great advance in mechanical science during recent times, and from the facilities which we now have of executing certain classes of work by machinery. Both these require to be taken advantage of, and to be allowed their due influence on our style. I know that with regard to this last there exist some very strong opinions. We hear a great deal about "handwork," everything must be handwork. Very true of everything which is in any way also headwork. But to insist that purely mechanical operations, such as the dressing of building-stones, or the "running" of mouldings, should be done by a human machine, instead of being done very much better by a soulless machine of wood and iron, is as absurd as to forswear broadcloth, and refuse to wear anything which is not hand-knitted.

Again, there are kinds of work which, although known

[1] From the manner in which timber of all sorts is now usually obtained through the market, instead of being felled for the special purpose for which it was wanted, as it used to be, much excellent old carpentry is unsuitable for modern imitation, even in oak.

in the Middle Ages, were very little used; as, for instance, turning, which is a most beautiful and appropriate treatment for wood, and one which may be used when poverty forbids the employment of any other means of obtaining refined ornament. And yet it is almost wholly neglected,[1] except for the production of caps, bands, and bases, which have no business to exist in woodwork at all. Prejudice in a like manner prohibits the use of cast iron for many purposes for which it is excellently fitted. Now, what is there wrong in cast iron? Is it the casting, or is it the iron? If the former, how comes it that it is lawful to use cast bronze? And if the latter, why is not wrought iron also forbidden? Casting is in its proper place just as legitimate for iron as it is for bronze, or as hammering is to iron. We need not make sham wooden tracery of it as the early Gothic revivers did, and as a few churchwardens still think it very clever to do; but there is no reason why we should confine its use to gutters, downspouts, and air grates. External railings, for instance, are always better in cast iron than wrought, because it is more durable when exposed to the weather. Even granting there were one period or style which could be shown to be better than all others, if a strict adherence to it in all matters be insisted upon, even though the model were absolutely perfect, the inevitable result must be that our architecture will be-

[1] The few of us who do sometimes use it generally get roundly abused for our pains. Our good friends the critics will not allow any turned work —except the above-mentioned caps, bands, and bases—to be Gothic; and, however much it may differ from the work done in the reign of King James, they persist in describing it by the uncouth word *Jacobean*.

come false, superficial, and uninteresting, just as it was fifty years ago during the "pure Greek" mania. On the other hand, we must guard against being led away by the clamour of the bigoted little clique,[1] who, thinking to be heard for their much speaking, seize upon every opportunity of repeating their well-worn platitudes about "modern science" and the "dark ages," and of calling upon us, in season and out of season, to ignore all that is past, and beginning *ab initio* to invent a style "suitable to the advancement of the nineteenth century." It is impossible to throw away the past, and even if it were possible, we should be fools to do it; for the old styles contain the accumulated art-experience of all time. Nothing but the most intolerable self-conceit will enable a modern artist to despise such a treasure-store, and nothing short of complete ignorance can excuse a critic for desiring him to do so. Let us regard our old buildings as we do our old literature. No one either abuses Mr Morris because he is avowedly a follower of Chaucer, or blames him because he does not imitate Chaucer's grammar and spelling. Then let not an architect be subjected to such treatment, either on one side or the other.

Pedantry, although a great cause of weakness, has at least one valuable quality, in that it acts as a check to

[1] A few years ago one of these worthies publicly proposed that the architects, who were invited to send in designs for the intended new law courts, should be forbidden to use pediments or pointed arches! Surely the pedantry, which would go out of its way to avoid forms which have been used before, is not less than that which would insist upon their being adhered to.

vulgarity, the other most common vice of our modern church architecture. The two may coexist, and indeed the English imitators of the thirteenth-century French Gothic often succeed in uniting the extremes of both; but our own mediæval architecture is, as a rule, exceedingly free from the fault of vulgarity, and so long as it continues to be looked upon as a standard of excellence, it cannot fail to have a beneficial influence.

By far the most fruitful source of vulgarity is the quality which in office-slang is called "go"—a quality which is constantly being preached up as a good quality, and the absence of which is by itself often held to be sufficient to condemn a design. I must, therefore, ask the indulgence of nonprofessional readers whilst I examine it somewhat at length.

"Go" takes a very great variety of forms. It is not confined to any one style, but, as the early French Gothic happens to afford more opportunities for its display than any other, that style is most often selected by its votaries, indeed, many of them affect the utmost contempt for all others. The common symptoms of it in our churches are harshness, even to brutality, of general design, with studied ugliness and systematic exaggeration and distortion of details, stumpy banded pillars, stilted arches, a profusion of coarse carving, notches, zigzags, curves, whose

"Wily turns and desperate bounds"

baffle all description, and long, wiry crockets, bursting out of unexpected places, and looking more like hat-

pegs than anything else in the world. "Go" is, in fact, architectural rant, and may be defined as the perpetual forcing into notice of the personality of the architect.

The most perfect art, whether in architecture, sculpture, poetry, or anything else, is that in which the artist does not appear at all, where everything is arranged in a natural and perfect order, which so entirely satisfies the mind, that a man would as soon think of demanding why this or that is so, or so, as he would of inquiring why the wind blows or why the sky is blue.[1] This is the true *ars celare artem*, and it is as far removed from "go" as the north is from the south. The man of "go" cannot comprehend it, and its results he heartily despises. "What is the good of being an architect if one cannot show off?" "See," says he by his work, "what a clever fellow I am. Look, here is a rafter poking across, just in the one place of all where it would be least expected. But I care not; a difficulty is my opportunity—indeed, between ourselves I contrived this one on purpose. Now observe: I thrust this window on one side, and I narrow that one, and I depress this arch, so as to give me plenty of room. Then under the rafter I put a huge corbel, and to carry that a great cap, and under that again a marble shaft about three-quarters of a diameter high and a base, which lastly stands upon the back of a half figure issuing from the wall and personifying the polar star. Thus I make the

[1] Of course, both works of art and the phenomena of nature may be subjected to scientific investigation, but I here speak of their enjoyment, not of their analysis.

abnormal rafter an interesting feature in my design. And notice, further, how my system of corbels does not project at right angles from the wall, but at an acute angle in the direction of the rafter. It is not every one who would have thought of that. Now, am I not a great architect, and thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the Middle Ages?". Thou fool, wouldst thou call men together into the market-place to see thee open an oyster with a crowbar?

Art at first sight affords satisfaction, which, upon leisurely contemplation, becomes gratification. "Go" produces no more than surprise, which, as it wears off, gives place to disgust. "Go" affects originality, but it displays none; the same stale tricks are played over and over again, and their use shows no more readiness of invention than Mr Manhug's scraping of the ceiling. In short, "go" is the architectural wearing of his hat on one side, whereby a man imagines he looks very knowing, whilst really he does but mark himself out as a snob. "That 's villainous, and shows a most pitiful ambition in the fool that uses it."[1]

Next after "go," nothing has caused so much vulgarity in recent church designs as the comparative cheapness and ease with which a great variety of coloured materials may now be obtained. One may often see a small church, scantily furnished, yet overlaid with alabaster, and marbles, and granites, and mosaics, and painted tiles, more than enough to deck out a building ten times the size. A great variety of material is a very danger-

[1] Hamlet's advice to the players is an excellent essay on "go."

ous thing. It may be managed with success, but it requires far more skill to do so than can produce a good result from simpler means. Good architects, therefore, generally avoid it, but inferior men eagerly make use of "rich" materials as the easiest way to obtain the appearance of expensiveness which is the delight of vulgarians, and which they describe as *handsome*, an epithet truly their own.

To pedantry and vulgarity, the commonest causes of our modern failures, may be added a third, feebleness, which, however, is almost a necessary consequence of the first. So long as men are taught the all-importance of style, and are referred to the works of the past as the sole source of inspiration, they must almost necessarily confine themselves to the study of mere detail; and in practice we find it is so. There are numbers of buildings, of which every little bit examined separately is fairly good, whilst as whole designs they are as unsatisfactory as can well be. Their authors should not be classed with the no-architects, what they do shows us that they are not without taste, and in better times they might produce good if not great work; it is now their misfortune and fault that they do not possess sufficient original power to overcome the effects of a vicious education.

To point out faults is much more easy than to correct them, but, as without it this section would be incomplete, I will now attempt to show how those we have been considering may be avoided. The first matter of moment is the choice of style in which to work, because

although, as I have said, style is *per se* of little consequence, with respect to the artist it is of the greatest importance, for, it being essential to good art that the artist should be above his style, it is obvious that he cannot do well in a style which is beyond his management. It is the fashion to praise *severity*, as it is called, and we are often advised to study and imitate the earlier and cruder styles, whilst it is objected against the later and more developed and finished schools that they contain in their very perfection the elements of decay. This is indeed true in the sense that a ripe strawberry contains in its very ripeness the seeds of its rottenness, but it is strange to argue that either styles or strawberries are therefore best when they are green. A style when it has reached its highest perfection is never severe, because those who use it must, in order to perfect it, have obtained so complete a mastery over the means they employ that they are able to do what they like with them. There is, however, one most excellent reason for now preferring a severe rather than a free style. What Horace says to poets is equally good advice to architects—

> "Sumite materiam vestris . . . . æquam
> Viribus, et versate din quid ferre recusent,
> Quid valeant humeri. Cui lecta potenter erit res
> Nec facundia deseret hunc nec lucidus ordo."

If we are ever to do anything good, we must work within our power. The free styles can only be mastered after a long apprenticeship in the severe, an apprenticeship not of one lifetime, but of many. Now we modern architects are but beginners, the most ex-

perienced of us do but represent the traditions of two generations. We can no more hope to work with success in a style such, for instance, as that of the Lady Chapel at Ely, or the Percy Monument at Beverley, than we can to rival the sculpture of Phidias, or the painting of Michael Angelo. But, if we will be modest enough to attempt nothing more in the way of style than is easily within our power, we may produce right excellent results, and may inaugurate a school which, perhaps, our great-grandchildren may perfect to a degree of luxuriance equal to anything in the past.

It should, however, be understood that severity is not synonymous with "earliness." The earliest styles are severe, it is true, but there is nothing to prevent a "perpendicular" building from being as severe as a "transitional." And, above all, we must guard against the common fault of mistaking barbarism for severity. A severe style is properly defined as one of which the component parts are few and simple, and this is compatible with the most extreme refinement.

The only other lesson we have to learn is how to apply our style to individual cases. Horace shall tell us this too—

> "Ordinis hæc virtus erit et venus, aut ego, fallor,
> Ut jam nunc dicat jam nunc debentia dici."

When we have a building to design, be it a church or anything else, the first thing is to ascertain exactly what are its requirements, both practical and æsthetic; and then, having determined exactly what ought to be done, do it in the most simple, natural, and straightforward

manner possible. Let everything have its due consideration, and neither be exaggerated nor slurred over, and let affectation of every kind be avoided.

> "Still follow SENSE, of every art the soul,
> Parts answering parts shall slide into a whole,
> Spontaneous beauties all around advance,
> Start even from difficulty, strike from chance,
> Nature shall join you ; time shall make it grow
> A work to wonder at."

## *SECTION XXXI.*

### OF ORNAMENT AND ORNAMENTS.

UNDER this head I propose to consider those decorative objects and features which an intelligent designer makes use of, not for the sake of their intrinsic beauty, but in order thereby to obtain certain definite and desirable results in his work.

It is one of the most vulgar of errors to imagine that a great deal of ornament will make a building beautiful. Richness or plainness is really a question of funds, rather than of art, except, indeed, that the more ornament is used the more difficult it is to manage, and consequently the greater chance of failure there is in inexperienced hands. A real architect will produce a pleasing result with very simple means. And, on the other hand, Mr Flick may cover his building with trimmings, yet will all but serve to make its meanness the more despicable. In these days of cheap church building, this error is particularly unfortunate; on all sides we may see its effects in the shape of wretched, starved, pinched-up churches, wherein the solid advantages of convenient plan and substantial construction have been sacrificed, in order to pay for a lot of trumpery "ornament," incapable of giving real pleasure to any one.

Ornament, to be worthy of the name, must be the

result not of caprice or chance, but of intelligent study; and from not being so, the majority of the so-called decoration of modern buildings is simply disfigurement. Ornament is the seasoning of a design. The design may exist, and be good without it, but it should be better with it. But the blind, unthinking addition of it, is as little likely to produce a pleasing result as the haphazard admixture of condiments in the mysteries of the kitchen. By the skilful management of unadorned constructive forms, a building of great dignity and grandeur may be produced, but there is something of harshness and want of refinement about it, which forbids us to rank it as a perfect work. In the use of ornamental detail, we have a means of correcting[1] this fault, and at the same time of introducing numberless incidental beauties, which add much to the interest and perfection of the design. The right use of this means is a matter of the greatest importance, notwithstanding what has been said about the error of those who look upon detail as the essence of architecture. It is, indeed, hopeless to expect a design to be satisfactory which is only a compilation of separately studied parts. The whole must always be kept in view, but it is not therefore the less true, that every single part, no matter how insignificant, must be suitable and good in itself. True excellence lies in the union of dignity with grace, to obtain which it is, above all things, necessary that the

[1] It has been reserved for modern architects of the "Go" school to use ornament as a means of *producing* harshness.

ornament should be properly subordinated to the general design.

This is the chief and commonest use of ornament, and it may be used even in the simplest buildings. But there are others—the maintenance of due "scale," the accentuation of particular features or qualities, the leading of the spectator's attention to or away from particular points, the veiling of accidental faults and many such like, to examine which separately would make this paper more technical than is desirable, but it is necessary that they should be understood by all who would design intelligently. Every true ornament has a distinct æsthetic function, and is an essential co-efficient in the design of which it is a part. I do not mean that an artist must formulate his reasons for everything which he does—as a matter of fact, he for the most part works instinctively—but the reasons exist nevertheless, and may be found if sought for; and in some cases—as, for instance, where radical defects of proportion have to be corrected by decoration—it is almost necessary to take them into account.

The forms of ornament are almost infinite, and as with its uses the detailed discussion of them would be too technical to interest the general reader; but a short examination of a few of those which most affect our church architecture, and concerning which building committees and others who must be listened to, not seldom to the great embarrassment of their architects, express very decided, and often very irreconcilable

opinions, will, I think, be not without profit. To these, and to a few which are naturally connected with the supposed infallibility of mediæval precedent, I shall endeavour to confine myself. For in this section I address the public only. All architects who think about their work, that is to say, all real architects, already know all that I can tell them; and as for the rest, in spite of what I or any one else may say, they will still go on cumbering the earth with their abominations, all the while most sublimely unconscious, that their cockney "Gothic," and their Manchester "Gothic,"[1] is ten thousand times further removed from the real spirit of the old style they pretend to follow, than the most "classic" of "classic" work done by men, who know what they are about.

An ornament is not necessarily beautiful in itself. A triglyph for instance, or the fluting of a pillar, a nail-head or a cusp, are, looked at separately, none of them particularly pleasing, yet used with judgment they may be of great value in a design, as indeed sometimes may utilitarian objects not generally considered as ornamental, even a down spout or a gas pipe. And on the other hand, works valuable for their own art qualities, as painting or sculpture, may be used for a decorative purpose with respect of the building in which they are placed. It is of course desirable not to use ornaments which are

[1] There may, I think, be observed two distinct schools in the sham Gothic of the day; the Manchester school, which is feeble, wiry, wretched, and mean, and the London school, which is loud, coarse, vulgar, and "*go*"-*ose*. Sham classic has for thirty years ceased to be used in church work, so we need not inquire into it.

positively ugly, but a study of our old churches will show that even such [1] may be employed with excellent effect It is, however, a mistake to suppose that an intrinsically beautiful ornament is always to be preferred to one which is not so. For instance, the slight harshness, and, if I may call it so, pungency of such ornaments as the nail-head, is often a useful element in a design, and it would be lost by the substitution of more elegant forms.

The commonest of all architectural ornaments are mouldings, but, as for the right understanding of them professional knowledge is most especially necessary, I shall say very little about them. Mouldings are used for nearly every purpose for which uncoloured decoration can be used, but speaking generally, their use is to give a pleasing form to constructive features. In doing this, it is important that the real function of the moulded object be not lost sight of. For instance, if it has to bear a weight, it should not be cut up with deep hollows, until it appears to be too weak for its work. Critics who talk about the "bold shadows" of the mouldings of the thirteenth century, should reflect that those shadows are obtained by cutting deep channels in the stone, whereby of course its strength is really greatly reduced, and to the eye still more so. Shadow is indeed of great value to the architect, but in works of constructive importance, it is to be obtained rather by the judicious proportioning of the "orders"—that is, the separate rings or courses

[1] For instance, many—it is indeed scarcely too much to say most—ornaments of the Norman period.

of stones—than by the subdivision of them into strongly-marked mouldings. In light decorative work, which is at once seen to have no influence on the stability of the fabric, undercutting is quite allowable. But an arch carrying weight ought not to be scored with a number of parallel black lines, which make it resemble a bundle of bent reeds. There is nothing "bold" about that, it is the exact contrary; the arch should by its design express its power, and its more than power, to do the work assigned to it, not vulgarly and ostentatiously, as when tainted with "go," but with quietness and confidence, the two great elements of that *repose* which is essential to all good architecture.

I have before spoken of the absurdity of copying in wood and other materials, details and mouldings originally designed for stone, and only suitable to it. Every material and every variety of material has its own beauties and capabilities, and it should be so used as to display the one and not belie the other.

Carving is, perhaps, of all kinds of ornament the one, in the use of which modern architects have committed the greatest excesses, and have been most encouraged by their employers. This love for carving is akin to that for "rich" materials; the things are not desired for their own sakes, or for their æsthetic value, but for the appearance of costliness, which they are supposed to give. The demand has been for quantity, and, therefore, as might have been expected, the quality has, as a rule, been execrable, and the distribution as bad. The amount of bad carving which has been done during the

last twenty years, is most astonishing. One cannot but wonder where men have been found to do it all. It is lavished not on churches only, but on buildings of every class, public or private, and has, let us hope, reached its climax in that wonderful combination of all modern "Gothic" abominations—the new bridge at Blackfriars.

There are a few tolerably good carvers amongst us, who, under a better system might possibly form the basis of a true school; but now they do no good at all. Instead of doing their best, and receiving remuneration for what they do, in proportion to their skill, they become wholesale manufacturers, working little themselves, but employing numerous "hands," and striving only to "turn out" the greatest possible number of "orders" at the shortest notice. It is perfectly natural that the quality should be continually sinking; there is no carving done fit to be compared with some which was done more than twenty years ago under Pugin and Carpenter, or with that in the Westminster Palace. Our carvers are mere mechanics, and a judicious architect has no option but to use them as such. I strongly advise men either not to make use of sculptured decoration at all, or at least not to attempt the higher types of it, but to use it only in crestings, friezes, and the like, which repeat, and of which an approved and corrected model may be followed throughout. This system may be applied to all sorts of carving, but, as a rule, the result will not repay the trouble, and it is best to use other methods of obtaining the desired effect. Carving

thus done will, it is true, never have anything like the life and vigour of the best mediæval work—that is now absolutely unprocurable—the work when closely examined will be of little interest, but its effect architecturally as part of a whole design, may be very good, and with that view only should it be used. We shall never again have a really living school of carving, until the art is taken up by men of a much higher stamp than those in whose hands it now is. There is no reason why it should not be, and if good work were valued, even by a small minority of the public, I believe men would soon be found to do it; as witness the analogous case of glass painting. We have the ruck of tailors and their congeners, but besides them there are a few real artists who understand and care for their work. They are indeed very few, but there is a wholesome emulation amongst them, and no year passes without improvement of some sort. Why should it not be so with carving?

Although I strongly recommend, and in my own practice always adopt, a very limited use of carving, yet, as this is for reasons which are, we will hope, temporary, the consideration of its more general use will, I think, not be out of place.

I shall not re-open the old questions about "natural" and "conventional," "stiff" and "crisp," and the like, concerning which men quarrelled much in the early days of the "Gothic" movement. It is enough to say that all are right when properly used, and all are wrong

when improperly used. Every good carver will have his own manner, in which he will work best, and it is for the architect to select the carver, and use his work, according to the requirements of each particular case. The only laws of general force are that the work shall be suitable to the material in which it is executed, and to the purpose to which it is to be applied. All else is like "style" in architecture, simply local and accidental.

Respect for the material is absolutely necessary, in order to obtain good carving, for without it there can be no ease or freedom. Our own carving in wood and stone during the mediæval period gives a good illustration of this. As early as the twelfth century we find stone well treated, and the carving, though inferior to much which followed it, exceeding vigorous, lively, and beautiful. We have no remains of wood-carving before the thirteenth century,[1] and then but few; and these exceedingly poor, being only feeble and spiritless copies of the contemporary stonework. A little later, in the Winchester choir-stalls, the carving of which is much in advance of the rest of the work, we see the carvers begin to understand their material. From that date, wood-carving has a treatment of its own, advancing *pari passu* with stone-carving, but always distinct from it, till the two became jumbled together again under the

[1] The caps in the twelfth-century screen at Compton in Surrey, if indeed it has still escaped the destroying hands of the "restorers," are so decayed and choked with whitewash, as scarcely to form an exception. They appear to have been very rude.

tyranny of the "orders," and both of them sank into mere manufactures. With the "revival" have come in "periods," and as the early ones are the most in fashion, we have generally gone back to the barbarism of copying all woodwork from stone, so that most of our modern wood-carving adds this impropriety to the feebleness which it shares with the stonework. The same has to be remembered in designing wood or stone-carving as in joinery and masonry, namely, that one is to be formed out of tough fibrous bars and slabs, and the other out of what are practically amorphous lumps.

Besides this general distinction, each separate kind of material has the treatment best suited to it; for instance, with a fine grained material, a delicacy and minuteness may be used, which it would be absurd to attempt in a coarse. And hard marbles and the like should not be treated like chalk or Caen-stone, although mediæval examples of such treatment may be found. Mere difficulty of execution is of itself no merit—you would not think any better of your coat or your tailor, if he assured you that he had cut it out with a carving knife. In these manufacturing days, an architect may get anything he chooses executed, provided only that he gives sufficient drawings for it; and if its monstrosity be sufficiently obvious, the vulgar will gape, and stare, and praise the thing hugely, but it is none the less a monster for all that.

There is room for much difference of opinion as to the adaptation of architectural carving to the purposes for

which it is to be employed. Some men may condemn what to others will seem quite allowable. To me, I must confess, very much of our old carving, though in itself excellent, appears very faulty in this respect. For instance, those caps, corbels, and the like, in which delicate and flexible foliage has the appearance of supporting heavy weights, are to my eye very unsatisfactory, and perhaps the more so, on account of the excellence of the carving itself. I think that carving may be used as an enrichment for constructive features, but not as a substitute for them. The form of the cap, or the corbel, or whatever it may be, should be there visibly doing the work, and carrying the carving, not in any way supported by it. In short, if carving is used there, it should be in the forms of *paterœ*, wreaths in hollows, and such like, mixed with and altogether subordinate to mouldings. In support of this opinion I may cite the practice of the English architects of the later half of the Gothic period, which will be found almost invariably to agree with it. Nor is any undue restraint thereby laid upon the carver, but rather he is left more free, for, when the carving is so used that some of the main lines of the design depend upon it, a degree of uniformity is necessary, which is not needed where it is used only as a filling in between these lines. M M., the critics, I know, call this kind of work "late and feeble," and contrast it with the "bold" French carving of the thirteenth century, but as "lateness" with them is as the sin of witchcraft, and all refinement is "feeble," and "bold" only means clumsy, I do not think it necessary to dispute with them.

It may be argued that in, for instance, a capital of the "Corinthian" type, the foliage does not carry any weight, but only clothes a solid mass which does. This is all very true, but it does not really touch the case, for, to the *eye*, the whole superincumbent weight rests on the carving. Indeed, it is this fault which, perhaps almost more than the comparative want of refinement in its detail, makes the Roman Corinthian so inferior to the Greek Doric and Ionic "orders." In Gothic caps of this type, the evil is much increased, for the weight on the abacus, instead of being kept back flush with the face of the shaft, is much broader than it in every direction, so that it appears more distinctly to stand upon the leaves.

If the employment of carved foliage to bear burdens is to be condemned, still more so is that of animal forms. Instances of it may be found in almost every age, and sometimes of the most excellent sculpture. But I do not hesitate to call all of them, from the *Caryatides* of the *Erechtheum* to Peter Vischer's snails at Nuremburg, unpleasant objects to look at, and great blemishes in the works in which they occur. Let everything be done naturally. If a pillar is wanted, make a pillar, not the portrait of a young woman carrying the roof of a house on her head; if a corbel, make a corbel, not a man's head poking in some inexplicable manner out of a solid wall; if a candlestick, make a candlestick, not a little boy half the height of the candle, and holding it at arm's length, fixed into a flower nearly as big as himself; if a pillar wants a pedestal, give it a pedestal, do not make

it stand upon the back of a lion. In short, let everything look like what it is, not like a model of something which it is not.[1]

The use of heads and masks for label terminations and stoppings to mouldings, is another objectionable practice, and none the less so, because moderns, instead of using modern heads, copy those of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In short, all use of severed members of bodies, as heads, legs, or arms in architectural design, seems to me barbarous, and to be avoided, no matter how respectable precedents may be cited for it. Portrait busts and such like may, if it be thought fit, be introduced, but they should be contained in medallions and panels, which, and not the sculpture, should be the *architectural* features.

The mediæval carvers were many of them facetious fellows, and, as they felt perfectly at home in church, thought it no harm to let off their jokes there, as well as anywhere else. These *grotesques*, as by a perversion of the word they are called, are characteristic of the times, and as such are of great interest; but some moderns have mistaken them for characteristics of the *style*, and

[1] This maxim is of much wider application than only to the misuse of sculpture. Sins against it are common, and very various; from the twelfth century niche-canopy like a miniature fortress, with towers, walls, and battlements, to the modern timepiece like a Roman altar, a boy with a wheelbarrow, the west front of a church, or whatever it may be, with a dial stuck into it *somehow*. These things indicate either a crude, archaic style, as yet unable to deal with any but the broadest effects, or a most debased taste. The first sort, when genuine, we can respect, the latter are always contemptible.

have imitated them accordingly. Now there are two reasons why this should not be done; first, that churches are not fit places for laughable representations; and, secondly, that the only laugh which our modern architectural carvers are capable of raising is one at their own incompetence. All is not "grotesque" which is ugly. The old carvers, working as their fancy led them, often ran into extravagant excesses, and we are perforce compelled to admire, though we may not approve the work; but it is very different when a modern, striving above all things to be "Gothic," appends to the end of a label-moulding a laboured yet feeble caricature of an emaciated dog, with a row of warts up his back, clinging to a wall from which he must certainly fall, but for the adherence of the aforesaid label-mould to his hinder parts.[1]

The use of the would-be grotesque in church work has, of late years, been less and less encouraged by our best architects. But the use of monstrosities, both in carving and painting, appears, I am sorry to say, to be on the increase. It is scarcely possible for a monster to

[1] The power of producing or enjoying the grotesque is not dead amongst us, but the carvers, being only mechanical style-workers, have it not. Some of the initial letters in *Punch*, for instance—they are in this respect better than the more formal illustrations—show that it still lives vigorously. There was one a few weeks ago, truly "Gothic" in spirit, and worthy to be ranked even with the Westminster misericords. It represented a seal pointing out to a tortoise the high comb in the back of a girl's hair. The glee of the seal and the consternation of the tortoise were admirable. If there was a fault it was the superfluousness of the label from the seal, "Now, old fellow, you 're in for it."

be otherwise than hideous and disgusting, and therefore unfit to be admitted into a church, howsoever "symbolical" it may be. If a prophet, attempting to describe in words a vision utterly beyond the reach of human imagination, has made use of expressions which are intended to convey ideas not forms, is not a vulgar, materialistic, and literal interpretation of those expressions, a gross degradation both of the seer and the vision, excusable perhaps in a barbarous age, but unpardonable in one which prides itself on its "enlightenment?" The popular representations of angels as human beings with wings may perhaps be tolerated, for they bring about no deformity, and the wings may be looked upon rather as garments than as integral parts of the body. But what shall we say of human bodies, feathered and balanced on wheels like mountebanks, or with eyes all over them, or with four heads of four different beasts? "*Humano capiti*," &c., the quotation is somewhat musty, and strange as is the poet's intentionally absurd compilation, it has even been surpassed in the name of the Christian religion. Over the south door of the cathedral at Worms,[1] there is set up a colossal form of a woman seated on a limping thing—it is a libel on creation to call it a beast—which may be thus analysed: there is the body of a horse, the tail of an ass, four legs, one human, one of a cow, one of a lion, and one of an eagle,

[1] This is of course an extreme case, and I doubt whether even Germany can show another such instance of obtrusive bad taste. But combinations of the same sort, more or less offensive, are to be found all over Europe.

also four heads corresponding to the four legs. And this dull conceit, we are told, "symbolises" the catholic church. Why, it would be impossible to give the devil himself a more horrible "symbol." Verily, the fewer of these "symbolic" *fauna* find their way into our churches the better, I had liefer meet Pasht and Dagon there. Symbolic ornament, properly used, may add somewhat to the interest of a church, though it has not now, even if it ever had, any didactic value, but an alleged symbolical meaning is no excuse for a shocking representation.[1]

The Gothic revival being a reaction from a style entirely made up of shams, was not favourable to coloured decoration. It was deemed necessary to exhibit the materials employed, and paint, as tending to conceal them, was regarded with jealousy. Other causes also helped to its exclusion. Under the pseudo-classic *régime* men had long been taught to regard architecture as dealing with form only; and the old churches, to which the new school looked for instruction, were for the most part too liberally whitwashed, to afford any in the matter of colour. And even now, the true place of colour in architecture is recognised by very few; at best, it is regarded as a permissible superfluity, whilst to some it savours of false doctrine, heresy, and schism. We do, indeed, now and then hear of a church being what they call "polychromed," which generally means spattered

[1] The symbolic meanings ascribed to arrangements of plan are, as I have before pointed out, all *ex post facto*.

over with stencilled devices in the most violent of pigments, but for an architect to be allowed to complete his design with decorative painting, is a thing almost unknown. What is done is almost entirely in the hands of the tailors, and of a kindred race, who call themselves "ecclesiastical decorators."

Colour, far from being a matter of indifference, is a most important factor in design. By the ignorant use of it a good work may be entirely spoiled, and next after good furniture there is nothing so effectual as painting for removing the offensiveness of those wretched sham-Gothic buildings, which thrift forbids us to destroy, but which in their present condition are intolerable. The painting of a building may be postponed just as the steeple, or any other part of it, may be, but no interior should be considered finished, till all parts requiring it have been suitably coloured, and a pleasing harmony exists throughout.

The colour of every portion of an interior, walls, ceilings, windows, pavements, and furniture, all require consideration, both of themselves, and with respect to one another. The colours of walls and ceilings may either be those of the materials of which they are formed, or they may be painted. The former is, I think, best for all constructive features of stone, and the latter for plain wall spaces. But whatever is done, the aim should be to obtain a harmonious, and avoid a spotty effect, and therefore violent contrasts, such as the alternate banding of columns, the mixing of black and light

coloured bricks, in stripes or patterns, and such like favourite devices of the "go" school, should never be used. As a rule, it is best not to paint stone, except quoins in the midst of plaster, which should generally be painted the same as the plaster, and in places where it is liable to be rubbed against, and therefore to get dirty. Paint may be washed, and, when there is need, renewed, but the washing of wrought stone both disfigures and injures it. A painted dado round walls and pillars is easy to keep clean, and looks very well. All plaster ought to be smooth, and coloured, at least, with a plain wash; nothing can be uglier than the rough uncoloured stucco, which has somehow come to be regarded as correct in modern church work. Wooden ceilings are always better for being painted either entirely, or with the colour of the wood left as a ground; and stone vaults are generally the better for a little painting.

With the details of architectural painting, as with carving, for the best class of work it is necessary that great freedom be allowed to the worker; but, if the worker is only an unintelligent mechanic, we must use him as such, and be content with a lower type. There are one or two men who can enter into the spirit of a design; and know how, without sacrificing their liberty within their own art, to co-operate with the architect in producing the desired results. When such a man can be obtained, by all means let us employ him, and trust him, and be thankful. But the ordinary "decorators" know nothing of design; and what they lack in skill,

they appear to endeavour to atone for by the brilliance of the pigments, which they daub indiscriminately upon any architectural features which seem to them convenient vehicles for paint; whilst they cover the wall spaces with an endless repetition of monograms and "symbols," or lines ruled in imitation of masonry, with a sort of explosion taking place in the lower left-hand corner of each stone. If men of this sort are to be employed—and the choice is often between them and none—we must use them as we find them. Full and exact instructions must be given to them, and they must not be expected to think; they have not been brought up to it. As with carving under similar circumstances, a simple kind of work, and for the most part repeating ornaments, must be used; and stencilling, which better men use only occasionally, will be the chief means employed.

The form of coloured decoration, now most familiar, is painted glass. Of this I shall here speak only of the use; the art of glass painting is too large a subject to be treated of incidentally, premising only that there is no excuse for bad painted glass. Painted glass is not a necessary of life, so none at all is better than bad. But really good glass may now be obtained, and it costs no more than the bad, though sometimes one may have to wait a little longer for it. The stained glass manufacturers are legion, the badness of their work varying, as a rule, in direct ratio with the impudence of their advertisements; whilst the real glass painters are few,

but still there are some; and, of all the arts subsidiary to architecture, glass painting, I think, presents the most hopeful aspect.

A painted window seems now to be generally considered as an additional and accidental ornament to a church, not as an integral part of its design; and, consequently, windows of the most discordant character are often placed in close juxtaposition, an evil which is much increased by the fact that, in nine cases out of ten, the glass painter has never seen the place where his work is to stand. Such treatment is enough to ruin the best building ever designed, and least of all is motley the wear for a church. It is not enough that the windows should be each good in themselves, they must harmonise with one another, and with their surroundings. In short, they must be controlled by the same mind as the rest of the work.[1]

Another reason why an architect should always be consulted about painted glass, is the complete inability of the uninitiated to judge of a proposed window from

[1] The early Gothic revivers entirely failed to perceive the true place of glass painting in architectural design. They acknowledged that it was necessary to the completeness of the fully-developed styles, but there they appear to have stopped. To them painted glass was painted glass, and, if only every window in a church was filled with it, they were satisfied. Nay, some of them even advocated discordance. Mr E. B. Denison, I remember, in his "Lectures on Church Building," seriously proposed that the new church at Doncaster should be made "a museum of the works of all the best modern glass painters." I wonder what Mr Denison would have said, if his tailor had proposed to make his new coat "a museum of the works of all the best modern button-makers."

a representation of it on paper. If all who call themselves glass painters were artists, and could be trusted, this would do no harm; but as things now are, nothing is more common than for individuals or committees to be taken in by highly-coloured drawings, sent to them by advertising tailors and such men, and to waste money, which would have paid for good work, on rubbish, the worthlessness of which they do not discover till it is too late.

The importance of the painted glass in a design increases with that of the windows; and when, as in many old churches, they are large traceried openings, equalling, or even surpassing, in extent the unpierced wall space, it becomes so great, that I have no hesitation in saying that such windows ought not to be used unless there is a reasonable hope of their being filled with painted glass. In a poor parish, many small windows are more likely to have the glass found for them than a few large ones of the same total area, besides wanting it less if they have not. Traceried windows exist only for the sake of painted glass, and should not be used, where they are not likely to get it, except sometimes at a west end, or in some such place, where it is required to admit as large a quantity of light as possible.

There are many kinds of painted glass, and the architect must in each case determine which is most suitable. There are pictorial representations, taking up whole windows or considerable parts of them, these are generally more suitable to end than to side positions.

Then there is pattern glazing of light glass with more or less of colour intermixed, and with or without medallions of subjects. This is, I think, most suitable to windows of very simple design. And there are single figures under canopies, each occupying a light to itself, which may be used almost anywhere. Sometimes a combination of the two last may be used with excellent effect, particularly where, for architectural reasons, it is desirable to carry a continuous band of colour throughout a whole range of windows. But there is one form of it which is, I think, not to be commended, although it is much practised by Messrs Morris & Co., whose works always deserve respect. It is the placing of a single figure, without any preparation, in the middle of a light, otherwise entirely made up of uniform quarry-glazing. The two never seem properly to belong to one another, a defect which may be corrected by a very little modification of the groundwork as it approaches the figure.

For unpainted windows it is best to use common crown glass in small panes, either all alike, or arranged so as to form a border, or occasionally in more elaborate patterns. What is called "cathedral" glass, is an ingenious invention for spoiling interiors by throwing a sickly green light over them;[1] and the latest novelty in the

[1] One excuse given for the use of "cathedral" glass is, that it keeps the sun out of people's eyes. But it does not do so very effectually, and even if it did, the same may be done less offensively with a blind, or even by painting or white-washing the glass itself. Some contrivance often is necessary in old churches originally intended for painted glass, but now

use of it is an amusing example of the odd way in which our inferior architects profit by the suggestions made to them by their betters. It has often been pointed out, that the great variety in the colour and texture of old glass is æsthetically an advantage. To obtain this, our wiseacres select two different tints of "cathedral" glass, each as hard and uniform as it can be, and carefully specify that they are to be mixed together at random, in the proportion of $x$ of $a$ to $y$ of $b$. They may think that this produces the silvery effect of the old work, but to me I must say it appears as one ugly colour spotted over with another.

Before leaving the subject of window glazing, it will be well just to notice the ironwork to which it is fixed. It is now most common to place the *saddle-bars* outside the glass, which is wrong for two reasons. First, because the bars so placed cast a deep shadow on to the glass, which makes them appear from the inside as broad black marks across the windows, whereas, if placed inside they only appear of their real width, which need not be great. And secondly, because every puff of wind tends to tear glass away from bars placed outside it, whilst it does but press it against them if placed inside.[1] *Stanchions* or upright bars are quite unnecessary,

without it. But the architect of a modern church ought to arrange his windows so that the sun shall not get into people's eyes.

[1] Mr E. B. Denison in the book just quoted, whilst pointing out this objection, amusingly suggests that there should be two sets of bars—a little set inside to do the work, and a big set outside to be "Gothic." This deputy-poker idea is hardly what one would have expected to find in

except in very wide openings. Wire-netting is an ugly expedient, which should only be resorted to where there is real danger, and then it should be made to fit the lights, and spread all over the window.

Of pavements, it is above all things necessary that they be sober and quiet in colour. They may be rich if the character of their surroundings be such as to require it, but they must never be striking. A loudly-coloured pavement is very objectionable, especially when, as is often the case in modern churches, it is the only part of the interior which has any colour. For the plainer sort of pavements most hard stones may be used, either separately or judiciously mixed. They look best when used in small and generally uniform pieces,[1] but large flags are cheaper, and for that reason must sometimes be used. Small, plain, unglazed red tiles also make a very satisfactory pavement. They are as a rule best used alone, though occasionally the addition of a little black may be an improvement; but let us avoid any approach to those horrible checks and plaids in two, three, or four colours, which, as they make a great fuss at a small cost, are popular with tilemakers, and with certain classes of architects. Wood blocks also appear to make a satisfactory pavement, and they may be used

a book, which, allowing for the author's egotism and his craze on the subject of style, is, so far as it goes, and for the time it was written (2d edit. 1856), a very good one.

[1] This sort of pavement is very fit for churches where there are tombstones, as it works well round them, and they do not appear like patches in it, as they often do amongst tiles.

under pews, but I have not a sufficiently long experience of them to pronounce definitely in their favour.

For the richer sort of pavements marble seems to be the most natural material, but there may also be used glass in several forms, and earthenware either as *tesseræ*, shaped tiles, or "encaustic" or figured tiles. With all these very good and very bad work may be done, everything depending upon the judgment shown in their use. The best effect is, I think, generally obtained by using only one sort of material, except, of course, that the margins of steps and the like must always be of stone or marble. But on floor spaces, marble and tiles, or marble and glass, never seem to me to turn out so well as the same materials used separately.

*Encaustic*, or, as the old men used to call them, *painted* tiles, are generally considered the most "Gothic," and therefore the most "ecclesiastical" material for floors, and certainly very rich pavements may be made with them—that is, when used alone, for of all materials they are the most difficult to mix with others; with marble they obstinately refuse to combine, and even with plain tiles they cannot safely be used, except in very unequal proportions. But there is one great objection to painted tiles, which architects have for years been trying very hard to ignore. It is that they afford a very insecure foothold.[1] For this reason they

[1] The slight roughening of the tiles, which is now often used to improve their colour, does not help them at all in this respect, and unglazed encaustic tiles have in use so poor an appearance that they cannot be accepted as a substitute.

should never be used where there is traffic, and especially not in sanctuaries—now the most usual place for them—unless it is quite certain that the sanctuaries will be properly carpeted. Then they may be used, and indeed a rich tile pavement appearing at the sides of a carpet has an excellent effect.

There is also a further objection to the use of painted tiles, though of less weight than the other, which is that they wear out. Now it certainly seems fittest that in the fabric of a church intended to last for ages, mere surface ornament should not be employed in positions exposed to constant wear and tear.

The laying out, as well as the colour of a pavement, is of importance, principally as it affects the quality of *scale*.[1] The chief matter is to avoid large, striking devices, which carry the eye rapidly over considerable areas, and long continuous lines, except they are used for a distinct architectural reason, in which case they may be very useful.

In the richer sort of pavements, both ancient and modern, it is quite usual to find pictorial representations sometimes of considerable size and elaboration. A more ridiculous position for a picture could scarcely be found, except perhaps a man's back. Its absurdity was pointed out seven hundred years ago, by no less a person than St Bernard himself. "*Sæpe spuitur in ore angeli, sæpe*

[1] Westminster Hall, in its present condition, affords a striking example of the reducing effect a pavement may have, even where there is no variety of colour.

*alicujus sanctorum facies calcibus tunditur transeuntum.*"[1] The first objection, fortunately, does not now generally apply in England, though it does in all other parts of Christendom, so far as I know them; but the other must be true always and everywhere.

A pavement is not a bad place for the display of heraldry, so far as heraldry itself is now admissible, but there is so much humbug and affectation about its modern use, that it is generally best to avoid it.

Good furniture is, as I have just now said, the best of all ornaments for a church. Let the walls and ceilings be of the richest, both in material and workmanship, yet if it be empty, it will always seem cold and unnatural; and on the other hand, even the poorest interior may, by good furnishing, be made pleasing and interesting. The importance of furniture is practically acknowledged by everybody in their own houses. No one is content with a half-furnished dining-room, even though such furniture as there is be of the "handsomest" description. The magnificence of the sideboard is no compensation for the absence of the carpet, nor will the gorgeousness of the chimneypiece atone for the uncurtained state of the windows; still less are the barely necessary table and chairs held to be sufficient. The furniture need not be expensive, but it must be complete, or the room is felt to be unfinished and unsatisfactory. The same is equally true of churches, but there is not now one English church in a hundred of which the fur-

[1] *Apologia ad Gulielmum abbatem*, xii. 29.

nishing even approaches completeness.[1] Our forefathers made their church in every respect the best furnished room in the parish, but nowadays men seem content that it shall be the worst. At home, every modern improvement and refinement is taken advantage of, but at the church there reigns a *plus-quam*-mediæval barbarism; the walls are rugged and bare, and the furniture beneath that of a well-appointed kitchen in quality, and, except in the one item of pews, most scanty in quantity. It is true that now and then we find an ostentatious piece of magnificence in the shape of a reredos or a pulpit, but it is generally out of all keeping with its surroundings, and by the contrast rather increases than takes away from the general appearance of shabbiness. It is strange that men will not understand, that what is mean and shabby at home, is equally mean and shabby at church, and that anything which is not good enough for the drawing-room, is certainly not good enough for God's altar. The furniture and decorations of the church ought not indeed to be copied from those of the modern drawing-room—which, by the by, itself greatly needs reform—but the fundamental laws which should regulate both are the same. Church work differs from domestic only in its greater stateliness and solemnity. It is only the difference between the language of the Book of Common Prayer and the language of everyday life.

The furniture of a church may be divided into two

[1] Amongst the best are such of the eighteenth-century classic churches as have escaped Gothicisation, or, as it is grimly called, *restoration*.

classes, the permanent and the removable. Of the first are seats, screens, &c., which always remain in their places, and which, when once well made, will last for centuries. Of the second are carpets, curtains, and the like, which are sometimes changed, or even entirely taken away for a season, and which occasionally require renewal. The first are, of course, the more important, but so much has already been said about them in their special sections, and in the section on *style*, that I shall now confine myself to a few general questions, for the most part connected with the popular misapprehension of the requirements of what is called the "Gothic style."

Of all the blunders which are collected together in our modern churches, there is not one which contributes so much to their uncomfortable and unhomely, if I may be allowed the word, appearance, as the manner in which, in nine cases out of ten, the woodwork is finished. The whole area is covered with sticky-looking pews of an unpleasant yellow or red-brown colour, with roofs and what other woodwork there may be to match. It is held that no wood may legitimately be used except oak, or, failing that, deal stained to what by courtesy is called an imitation of oak, but which really is far more unlike it than the untouched deal. And then, to "bring out the grain," the whole is covered with a brilliant coating of varnish. Why other woods than oak or deal may not be used, or why it is necessary to stain the latter in "imitation" of the former, and to varnish them both, I am unable to understand. There seems to be

no reason why there should not be as wide a choice of material for church work as there is for domestic. All that is needed is, that whatever is chosen should be treated as its peculiarities require. Staining and varnishing, too, have their legitimate uses. If a wood is used, the native colour of which it is for any reason not desirable to retain, let it be painted or stained—sometimes one is best, and sometimes the other—but let it be with some good colour, visibly artificial, and therefore natural, and not with an "imitation" good or bad of anything which it is not. Granted that it is often not well to leave light-coloured deal untouched, why should we be bound to use nothing except these ugly "oak" stains? There are all colours to choose from, and in most cases plain green, or dark red, or black, are better than anything else. Varnishing, if it be well done, is often an improvement to plain colours, but I think should not be used on natural woods, especially upon those which exhibit strong markings. Such markings add much to the beauty of some woods when left alone, but, when exaggerated, they become disfigurements.

There is generally sufficient metal furniture of one sort or another about our churches to make its proper treatment a matter of considerable importance, but I will not waste time by a detailed examination of the trash which is sold as "mediæval metal-work." Let us suppose the metal-work as such to be good, there remains to be determined how it should be finished. Iron must be painted for its protection, but it is a mistake to

cover it with a combination of all the most brilliant pigments which can be found. As a rule, one good colour, or one colour judiciously mixed with gilding, is best. For light wrought iron scroll-work, and the like, nothing looks better than gilding all over. There can be no more magnificent furniture than of cast brass gilded; but the gilding is so costly, that it may not often be afforded except for small objects.[1] Next after gilding, nothing looks so well as the natural colour of the brass, kept bright by rubbing; but this requires an amount of labour and trouble, which is rarely bestowed on such matters. Sometimes brass, allowed to oxydise, till it takes a dark green colour, looks exceedingly well, but it does not suit all positions. Lacquering, which is the usual method of finishing brass-work, and which is *supposed* to look like gilding, is really far inferior in appearance to the rubbed metal. It must, I suppose, be tolerated, because it saves so much trouble, but a lacquered object has always a hard, uncomfortable, bran-new, manufactory sort of look about it, until the lacquer begins to wear through, and then all at once it becomes shabby.

Carpets and hangings, and such movable furniture, have considerable influence in an interior. In small churches they are of very great importance. Indeed, they are just as much part of the "architecture," that is,

[1] For lecterns, and other large pieces, the mercury process must be used, but electro-gilding does very well for altar candlesticks and such like smaller objects.

of the general design, as painted glass or any other ornaments, and ought equally to be under the control of the architect, instead of being, as they appear generally to be, put into the hands of either tailors or women, who often make of them a curse instead of a blessing. Passing over the frequent bad taste in selection of colours, and the still more frequent helpless ignorance whereby valuable means for good are used so as to be positively harmful, these "decorations" are often a source of real inconvenience. One may often see curtains put just where they are most in the way, and teasing little mats scattered about "correctly" in front of the altar, just where they are most likely to be stumbled over, and many like things. But perhaps the greatest height of absurdity is reached in what are called the "wings" of the altar. In old times churches were as draughty as most of them are now, and men used to put up high curtains at the ends of the altars to prevent the lights from being blown about.[1] The "correct" ones have got some vague idea of these things, but they interpret it after their own fashion. With the timidity natural to people who do not exactly know what they are doing, they make them small and very low, whilst, following the continental example, the candles are made excessively high, so that the candles far overtop the

[1] The protection afforded by such curtains properly managed is much greater than would be suspected by those who have not tried them. I am told that at one church where they have been put up, candles, which formerly would only last through two evensongs, will now last through five.

curtains, whose function it is to protect them. Besides this, the curtains, instead of being hung about at right-angles with the east wall, are spread out wide, so that they may be seen from the nave, or perhaps in imitation of the bad perspective of the old illumination from which the idea has been taken. And even this is not all, for along the top of the curtains, fixed in some way to the suspending rods, may often be seen a close row of candles, intended, no doubt, to give additional importance to the altar. But they defeat their own end most completely; for, by making a great blaze of light above the altar, they neutralise that which is in front, and throw the altar itself into shadow.

Like everything else about a church, the movable furniture and decorations should be regulated, not by caprice, but by common sense. There should be distinct reasons, practical, artistic, or both, for everything which is done, and everything used should be the best for its purpose which can be procured. For many years past, an immense amount of labour has been wasted in rug-work, and what passes for embroidery, which, when done, is not half so good either for appearance or use as many woven fabrics, which cost less than the materials of the other. Embroidery, like everything else, should not be admitted unless it is really good, a rule which would exclude by far the greater part of that which our churches now contain. The mediæval embroidery, though often very beautiful, is far from being absolutely and exclusively perfect, and moderns, for the most part,

copy its faults and avoid its beauties. The Indian, Chinese, and Japanese embroideries are, as embroidery, much better than the old English, and should receive their fair share of study from those who wish to practise the art here, as they certainly would have done had they been accessible in the Middle Ages. It is not the *style*, but the *fitness*, which is all-important. Just so in the choice of woven fabrics. Avoid the "ecclesiastical" shops, and go, as you would for anything you wanted at home, to the place where you know you will be best served. A good Persian carpet will look right well in front of an altar, whilst a blue thing spotted—I beg its pardon, powdered—all over with yellow *fleurs-de-lys* will look mean and paltry, notwithstanding its "correctness."

To examine separately the various movable decorations which may be placed in churches, would greatly add to an already over-long chapter, I will therefore only speak of the altar vestments.

The proper vesting of an altar is not regulated by antiquarianism—though it dates from very early times—nor by occult symbolism, but by logical reasoning. The first rule is that there shall be nothing on the top of the altar except *white linen*, in order that, should any accident happen with the chalice, the sacred species may be received and retained in a material in which its presence may be seen, and from which it can be removed. Now, although our altars are generally made up so as to look as if they were all right, it is very seldom indeed

that this most important rule is complied with. The top of the altar should be covered with a linen cloth twice its size, and doubled so as to form two thicknesses. The frontlet, or superfrontal, as it is called, is an apparel to this cloth, and sewed to one of its front edges. The frontal, or coloured altar-cloth, should hang separately from the altar,[1] the edge of suspension being hidden by the frontlet, by turning back which the frontal may be changed without disturbing the other vestments; for one frontlet may serve with a variety of frontals. It is best for the ends as well as the front of an altar to be vested, and I think the most convenient way of doing it, is to sew pieces the size of the ends, and of the same material as the frontlet, to the linen cloth to which it is attached. The last vestment is the long, fine linen cloth, about the same width as the altar, which covers the top and hangs down nearly to the ground at the ends. Strictly speaking, the name *altar-cloth* should be confined to this. When the altar is not in use, its top should be protected by a cover of some convenient material.

Some very "correct" people hang in front of their altars certain ribbons or flaps, which they call *stoles*, and which may have a purpose, but I think it would be well to refrain from using them till we know what it is.[2]

[1] I need scarcely say that it should be allowed to hang naturally, and not be stretched on a frame. Even fixing a frontal to a rod at the top is a mistake. It always gives it a distorted and *pulled* look.

[2] Something of the sort is shown in some old Flemish pictures, but I

In conclusion, let me protest against the very usual disfigurement of churches by the indiscriminate acceptance of gifts to them. Nothing is commoner than to hear, by way of excuse for the presence of some particularly hideous "ornament," the remark, "Oh, it was given, so we must use it!" Surely a huge *non sequitur*. If a man made you a present of stinking fish, you would not feel it your duty to eat it. People who give such things, do so from ignorance, and if it were generally understood that only what is suitable would be allowed to be set up or used in the church, they would not cease to give, but would be more careful to ascertain what would be acceptable.

have never found mention of them in any ecclesiastical writer, ancient or modern. Some years ago I inquired in *Notes and Queries* for any authority either for the things or the name, but in vain. If any one can now produce such, I shall be much obliged if he will do so.

## *SECTION XXXII.*

### OF PICTURES AND IMAGES.

I CLASS these apart from ornaments generally, because, although they may be used as ornaments, they are, or at least ought to be, themselves objects of special interest. It is not very easy to draw a definite line of demarcation between mere architectural ornament and work of a higher class; but a general distinction is, that the first is used, because its place requires it, and the other has a place found for it for its own sake. I am not concerned to argue the lawfulness or desirability of the presence of images and pictures in churches, for they are now acknowledged by churchmen of all schools, with the exception of a very few crotchety and uninfluential individuals, but what should be admitted, and how it should be admitted, are proper subjects for discussion.

We have seen that there are grades in architectural ornament, and that, if the highest cannot be obtained, the lower may, under proper restrictions, be employed. So also there are grades of pictures and images, from the German chromolithograph, or the rough plaster cast, up to the highest works of Raphael and Phidias; but whether there is any legitimate use for the lower orders,

depends entirely upon the way in which they are regarded. If a painting or a statue is looked upon as an offering of the highest human skill, set up in the church for its increased glory and dignity, there nothing but first-rate work is admissible. But if, on the other hand, the story of the picture is valued for its own sake, the inferior methods of representation may be used without blame, provided always that what is used is the best which can be procured. And this is a very common case. It is mere vulgar claptrap to assert, as is often done, that the use of printing has superseded that of pictures as means of instruction. Pictures are now, just as much as they were in the days of Paulinus of Nola, the books of the unlearned. The experience of the nursery and the schoolroom should be sufficient to convince people of that. The uneducated and the half-educated are far more easily impressed through the eye than through the ear. And they are, and in spite of education acts and school boards always must be, the vast majority of Christians—for reading, writing, and arithmetic alone are not education—and, as they have therefore the greatest share in the parish church, it is not reasonable that their special needs should be overlooked. But, says undecimarian respectability, we should go to church to say our prayers and be preached to, not to look at pictures—another claptrap. As though the one use of the church rendered the other impossible. I should like to be told *why* a man may not look at a picture in church. Nobody wishes to put doing so in the place of

attending to the service, or of listening to the sermon, even though the pictures be the more eloquent and instructive. Why may not a man attend to all if he likes? Objections can only be based upon what may be called the *meeting-house* theory about churches: the theory that a church is intended to be used at certain specified times, and for public worship and preaching only, which ended, the congregation are to be turned out, and the place locked up till the next "service-time." I believe that to this odious theory *alone*[1] is due the denationalisation of the church so far as it has taken place—it has been much exaggerated—and that all our improvements in church matters will have no influence on the masses until it has been totally abandoned. The parish church should be not only the place of public worship, but also the place of private meditation and prayer, and the common centre and home of all the religious action and organisation of the parish. Every parishioner should have free access to it at all reasonable times. Nay, it ought to be made interesting to attract him, and instructive to teach him when attracted. One church so used will do more good than a hundred of the coldly respectable places, in which well-to-do congregations assemble twice or thrice each Sunday, and perhaps once in the course of the week. Such a reform cannot be made in a day. People cannot all at once unlearn

[1] In saying this I am not overlooking the evil effects of the private pew system, for, but for the meeting-house theory, that, in anything like its present form, would be impossible.

the old prejudices, and realise that the church is intended for their own individual and personal use. But I am glad to say that in many places the work is well begun, and in some even now fairly complete. In them, and in them only, can pictures have any real use, for they are dumb in the presence of a crowded congregation, but all eloquent in the quiet stillness of the almost empty church. I am quite certain that if men only knew how useful pictures of the right sort may be, where there is opportunity for seeing them, their presence in our churches would be the rule and not the exception. I sometimes find myself in a church, in a neighbourhood the reverse of "respectable," where there are hung up the series known as the *Stations of the Cross*, and I have often watched how they have been studied. Sometimes may be seen a man or woman, seemingly almost ignorant of their meaning, yet led on by a kind of interest from one picture to another to the end; sometimes a group of children helping one another along with the story, sometimes again, a mother instructing her child, and so on; all going to demonstrate the power of the pictures to *bring home* the great drama of the Atonement, far above that of any quantity of Bible-reading or sermon-hearing. Surely that is enough not only to justify the presence of the pictures there, but to excuse their badness—and they are very bad.

In arranging subjects for didactic pictures the aim should be to make them teach dogma, not mere history. Moses amongst the bulrushes, or the Judgment of Solomon,

may make pretty pictures, but we want to teach men about the Incarnation and the Atonement. I would exclude all subjects from the Old Testament history; their typical meanings make some of them very fit for representation in the higher class of pictures, but they are above the understanding of people who are taught through the eye. Let us begin with the Annunciation, and go on with the most significant facts throughout in the gospel story. A consecutive and mutually dependent series have far more instructive power than a number of unconnected subjects. The *Stations* just mentioned are very good in intention, but they want weeding. Several of them, though they add to the dramatic completeness of the whole, are so apocryphal, that it seems to me not right to represent them as though they were equally historical with facts recorded in the Gospels; and one—that of the meeting of St Veronica—is positively objectionable from the countenance which it gives to a worthless fiction; nor can I see any reason why the series should be confined to the events of the Passion only. The Annunciation, the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, the Resurrection, and the Ascension, convey teaching which is certainly not less needed now than in time past.

It is also of the highest importance that the manner of representation should be such as may be understood of the people. Sculpture, painted glass, and engraving, though they may be excellent of their kind, will not do, for they are all more or less ideal, and require a degree

of education to be properly appreciated. What the *people* want is a downright literal picture with plenty of colour. Give them that, and they will not be critical about the artistic shortcomings of the work. On the other hand, we ought to be careful not to set up representations, which by their badness or their childish simplicity are calculated to excite disgust or contempt in people of refined taste; for the church is no more the exclusive property of the ignorant than it is of the educated. The pictures should be such as may be understood by the first, and at least not shock the others.

Paintings are of course what should be used, and by the best artists that can be obtained, not by the "decorators," who now generally "do" what little painting is admitted into churches. People seem to think that any picture is good enough for a church; they will give a fancy price for a work by a Leighton or a Millais to put in a dining-room, but to commission the same man to paint a picture for a church, is an idea which never seems to enter anybody's head. This is a great loss both to art and to the public. Art suffers, because of the many opportunities for high class and *monumental* painting, which are lost to artists. We really have not now any religious art in England—for the theatrical "Scripture pieces," which, together with the distressed cavalier and the happy cottagers, make up the stock-in-trade of the picture-manufacturers, whose works crowd the annual exhibitions, are neither

religious nor art—but it is only because there is no demand. We have the men who could produce it, but they must, perforce, confine themselves to portraits and cabinet pieces, for which there is a demand. The best modern religious pictures I know, are the *Stations of the Cross* in Antwerp Cathedral; and we certainly have living English painters, who could equal them, if we would only afford the opportunity.

The loss to the public is even more serious, for all good pictures being either in private hands, or in the collections in a few great towns, the vast majority of the people are never able to see them. But if every parish church were also the parish museum, and the parish picture gallery, as it was here in the Middle Ages, is now in many parts of the continent, and I hope before long will be here again, then every man, no matter how poor or how busy, would have frequent opportunities of seeing at least a few decent works of art, and of deriving such benefit as is to be derived from them.[1] I believe that it is nothing but the meeting-house prejudice which keeps them out of churches now. It is not the cost, for the money spent on a single painted window, or other such ornament as is admitted, is often much more than would pay for a really good picture. But I believe men really, though perhaps unconsciously, argue, "What is the use of putting a picture into a damp church, where nobody can see it except on Sundays?" It is good news indeed, that Hunt's *Light of*

[1] The great success of the Bethnal Green Museum shows that the multitude are not indifferent to them.

*the World* is to be placed in the Chapel of Keeble College,[1] and may that example be soon and largely followed in parish churches. How much better would it be to place such works as Millais's *Moses* in our churches, than in private halls and dining-rooms; and how many more of them we should have if we did; and how much would both the public taste and the artist's style be elevated. Nothing could be more calculated to correct that pettiness and prettiness, which is the besetting sin of modern painters, or to teach the public to value something higher in art than the sensational vulgarity of the race-course or the railway station.

We cannot hope that the majority of churches, at least for some time to come, will be provided with any number of original pictures, but there seems to be no sufficient reason why, for such as are shown to have a practical value, we should not take advantage of some of the multiplying processes now available. Chromolithograph and oleograph are certainly in every way inferior to hand painting, and I would have them admitted into churches only for *useful* pictures; but on principle I can see no argument against them which does not also condemn copper engraving. It does indeed happen that the few religious pictures now published in colours[2] are of wretched character, but that

[1] Where, let us hope, the blunder of making an "altarpiece" of it will not be committed.

[2] There are some very good large wood engravings, but for teaching purposes colour is absolutely necessary.

is accidental, and I am convinced that a publisher might safely bring out a well got-up series, designed by competent men, at prices no higher than are now charged for the bad; and if so, no parish need be without. The frequent repetition of the same pictures in different churches would, indeed, be to some extent an advantage.

Except the crucifix, which is more valuable than any picture, images have but little instructive power. A single figure, whether in sculpture or painting, though it may be full of teaching to the few, necessarily lacks the action, which would give it interest in the eyes of the many; and reliefs and groups of statuary are too ideal to be thoroughly understood or appreciated by them. There is, therefore, no such excuse for inferior images as there is for inferior pictures. There must be no plaster casts in the church.

Pictures are broadly distinguishable into those which are painted upon the walls, and those which are hung against them. Each class has qualities and capabilities peculiar to itself. A wall painting enters directly into the composition, and is, in fact, a portion of the architecture of the interior, which it may injure or improve, but cannot leave unaffected. Framed pictures, on the other hand, although they may take an important place in the general harmony, do so rather as furniture than as pictures; their direct influence being confined to their own immediate neighbourhood. The first class are theoretically the nobler and more dignified; but the others impose far less restraint upon the artist, and,

therefore, are to be preferred for many purposes. Let both be used in a church if they can be obtained.

Wall painting has so long been out of use in England, that its traditions have been entirely lost; and though now a few good artists are beginning to turn their attention to it, very little has really been done; and even a method of painting which will last has yet to be found. These difficulties may, however, be overcome by perseverance. Some failures must be expected, but ultimately there is no reason why *fresco*, or something like it, should not be in ordinary use amongst us; and if so, churches are by far the most suitable buildings we have for its display.

Wall painting, though it may represent historical or quasi-historical subjects, ought, from its nature, to be severe and conventional in its treatment of them. A wall, even though it be painted, should always appear to be a wall. It is shocking, and not pleasing, to the eye to see a boundless expanse of sky or landscape suddenly opening out, where it is instinctively felt that the view should be bounded. Consider, for instance, the combined effect of the real perspective of a chancel as seen through its arch, and the mock perspective of a picture painted over the arch. The arch appears to carry a great hole, above which the nave roof trembles in seeming insecurity; and, moreover, part of the chancel roof being visible under the arch, the spectator misses the rest, which ought to appear above it, in front of the clouds and flitting angels, or whatever it may be

that the painter has shown going on outside the building.

I do not say that an illusion of this kind should never be allowed to a painter, but only that he should not be allowed to make both ridiculous by mixing it up with architecture.[1] In a framed picture the utmost liberty may be given, because the frame forms a most perfect boundary to the picture, and effectually prevents it from becoming confounded with its architectural surroundings. As a piece of furniture, it may take its place harmoniously amongst them; and as a picture, it may be studied entirely without reference to them, which in the other case is impossible.

Mosaic is a kind of wall painting, which, in England, is of recent introduction; and it has of late years been so much misused, that it is not surprising that judicious architects are not very ready to adopt it. It is, however, worth cultivating, for it has the special merit of being unchanged by time. If, however, mosaic is used, it must be used boldly. Little bits of it timidly introduced here and there, amongst marbles and the like, have a most tawdry and ignoble appearance, especially if there is much gold in it. If used at all, it ought to give the tone to the whole interior; and its special characteristics are so marked, that it can rarely be used

[1] The Italians, great painters and always very shallow architects, have been great sinners in this matter. Sometimes they would even carry on the architecture of an apartment into a picture. A scene-painter's trick, which can only be classed with the other Italian practice of painting an elaborate architectural front on a dead wall.

with success in a building, which has not, from the first, been intended to receive it.

Modern mosaics have nearly always a great deal of gold, the backgrounds being generally all gold. But I think that in buildings of moderate size, a far better and richer effect would be obtained by using them entirely without gold. All mosaic—that is, all real mosaic, for I do not speak of imitations of oil-painting laboriously executed in mosaic—requires to be seen from a reasonable distance, in order that the separate particles which make it up, may blend together into a harmonious whole. It should, therefore, be used only in buildings of some size; and in them should be confined to the upper parts, where it will never be seen except from a distance. It is most unsuitable for reredoses, in which it is now chiefly employed, and the worst misuse of all is to make it the background for sculpture, as is often done.

Much judgment, or the want of it, may be displayed in the choice of positions for paintings and sculptures. It may seem superfluous to say that a picture or statue ought never to be placed in a position where it looks ridiculous. Yet the thing is often done. I know a church where there are painted on the east wall, at each side of the reredos, a row of figures about life-size, and not perceptibly raised above the pavement. The grotesque appearance of these gentry, mixing up as they do with the clergy and ministers moving about the altar, may be imagined. And not unfrequently pictures,

or sculptured panels on a smaller scale, may be seen placed so low that it is impossible to examine them without kneeling or sitting on the floor. It should, I think, be a general rule that no picture be placed below the level of the spectator's eye; and none, in which the figures approach real size, in any position where they are likely to be seen with people standing in front of them. The mediæval artists often placed rows of small single figures very near the floor, particularly on the sides of tombs, and in the lower panels of rood-screens, and it must be confessed that sometimes the architectural result is very good; but the figures are sacrificed, which they ought not to be.

The position of wall paintings, and of architectural sculpture, must, of course, depend upon the treatment of each particular building. But I think the paintings ought to be confined to plain surfaces, and not be carried round pillars or across angles, as was sometimes done in the Middle Ages. Pictures, suitably treated, may do well in domes, but the success of the Italian attempts to apply them to vaulted ceilings, is not such as to encourage imitation, and on plain ceilings, if treated flatly —as all painting on the fabric ought to be—they become grotesque; the figures appear lying on their sides or standing on their heads, or in other positions not dignified, as witness the ceiling of the nave at Ely Cathedral.

Framed pictures require to be placed where they may be seen, but, for reasons given in the section on the reredos, where they will not be unduly conspicuous. They

ought always to be against walls not against pillars. For a picture hung against a pillar, besides being a very ugly object when seen from behind, has always a look of instability, and of not fitting its place, and by its want of architectural repose it becomes obtrusive.

The size of pictures is not an unimportant question, though from their not being purposely[1] painted for their positions, it is often a matter of accident. Very large pictures ought not to be used, except in churches either of great size or specially built to receive them. A picture may appear as an addition to a church, but not as an incongruous addition.

Didactic pictures should be where people can get at them; that is, in the public part of the church; the best places for them are, therefore, the walls of the aisles below or between the windows,[2] and the west end of the nave. Where a church has an entrance hall, pictures may be well placed in it, if it be not too exposed. But I would not have them put there, until the church itself has been well furnished with them.

In arranging subjects for architectural sculpture and painting, whether upon the walls or in the windows, it is well to have one definite system throughout. A great deal of thought may be put into a building by such means, but it requires to be done with judgment. There

[1] In some old churches there are piers which are really portions of wall with large flat surfaces. Against them pictures may sometimes be hung.

[2] If the light is well distributed throughout the interior, as it ought to be, the pictures will not be obscured by being placed in this position, particularly if the windows have painted glass.

should be nothing violent, like the corbel heads all turning to the altar in the choir of Selby. Teaching of this sort should murmur, not shout. I shall not enter at length into the question of church iconography, for there may be any number of different systems—what will suit one church may not be fitting for another—and there are many trains of thought, which may be followed in arranging them. But let me here protest against the absurd dogmas which are from time to time put forward hereupon by the clever ones of the "correct" school. Subjects of one sort, they tell us, must only be put on the west wall, of another, only on the north, and so on, all which is pure nonsense, and for the most part is the offspring of the fertile imagination of the propounders. But even granting that it were all which they claim for it, namely, a code invented and adhered to by the mediæval artists, it by no means follows that moderns should be bound by it. So much of it as is genuine was no doubt intelligible and valuable in its day, but that day is long past. And we build for ourselves and for posterity, not for our ancestors, and to bind ourselves to the observance of the half understood rules of an obsolete, as well as obscure and fanciful symbolism, is the most ridiculous of pedantries. Let the church speak by all means, but not in an unknown tongue.

Framed pictures being, as I have said, of the nature of furniture, may well be left out of the general iconographic scheme. Indeed it is almost necessary that they should be so. For the higher class of them will always be, as

it were, accidental additions, and didactic pictures should form a series complete in itself, which it would seldom be possible to incorporate into the larger system.

The frames of pictures should be of simple design, generally either gilt, or black, or the two combined. The barbarism, called an *Oxford* frame, is unfit to enclose anything except the scale of fees at the entrance to a "metropolitan" cemetery. If inscriptions are to be added, let them be written in plain letters on the frame itself, or if that cannot be done, on a rectangular wood tablet hung below the frame, and let not "illuminated" scrolls or such frivolous trash be admitted upon any pretence.

The manner of representing religious subjects is properly a question for the painters and sculptors rather than for the architect, but it has received so little consideration in England, that I will venture to make a few remarks upon it. The first point which arises, is the degree of literalism or conventionality which should be used. But this must vary greatly, being influenced by the purpose and locality of the work, by the individual qualifications of the artist, and the nature of the subject represented. A painting on a wall, or in any position, where, as a picture, it forms part of the general design of the interior, needs much severer restraint than one which, with its frame, counts only as a piece of furniture. And liberties may be allowed to a great master, which an inferior artist should never dare to take. Again, some subjects, as, for instance, the Ascension and many scenes from the Apocalypse, if represented at all,

must necessarily be so in a very hieratic and conventional manner, or they become profane and vulgar caricatures. And, on the other hand, pictures intended to convey instruction can scarcely speak too literally, so long as due regard is kept for the dignity of the subjects; for nothing ignoble or grotesque should be permitted. Let the history of the Passion be tragic, not disgusting, and let the sportive imps and hobgoblins of mediæval *dooms* and such like find no place in modern art.

The question of costume in art is a peculiarly modern one. In the old simple days artists drew men as they saw them. All personages of whatever date, with the exception only of our Lord and His apostles, and the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament—for whom a kind of tradition of the Roman toga has been kept up even till the present day—were represented by them in the dress of their own time. To them a soldier was a soldier, and a priest, whether Jewish or Christian,[1] was a priest, and as such they drew them. This, though rude, was at least honest and intelligible, indeed, there was some philosophy in it. But there is certainly none in the modern practice of representing scriptural personages in mediæval masquerade. For the latter our architects are most often to blame. It is part of the "period" delusion. The mock-mediæval architects seem quite to lose sight of the spirit of the old work, in their zeal for the exact reproduction of the letter. A

[1] Or pagan either, no doubt, had they had occasion to represent a pagan priest. But I do not remember to have seen such an instance.

very characteristic example was published some time ago in one of the building newspapers. It was a figure intended for Gideon, taken from, I think, a reredos designed by an architect of some reputation, and one of the most exclusive of the thirteenth-centuryites. As represented he might have fought the Saracens, but never the Midianites. Every link in the habergeon, and every fold in the surcoat, may be—and very likely is—scrupulously correct, and exactly as a real thirteenth-century sculptor would have shown them. Yet not even the famous statue of Sir Cloudesly Shovel is more directly contrary to the mediæval spirit. The old artist would represent Gideon the conqueror by a knight of his own time, because to him knighthood was the highest known form of military rank; a modern working in the same spirit must draw him as a modern field marshal. But, it will be answered, that would be ridiculous. I know it would be ridiculous, but it would be in the true spirit of the thirteenth-century work nevertheless. The fact is, that we as a nation have passed out of the state of childish simplicity which could be satisfied with this sort of representation. We know too much; and to show the events of past history in the costume of the present day, is not now description, but burlesque. Nor, except that its absurdity is not patent to quite so many people, does there seem to be much difference between representing the personages of the Bible history in the costume of to-day, or in that of any past, but comparatively recent period. To fill

Pilate's judgment-hall with mediæval knights and lawyers, is but little less objectionable than to crowd it with grenadiers and policemen.

A religious picture is not history, but comment upon history. It is a poem or a sermon upon the fact represented, not a record of it; and therefore exact archæological accuracy is not needed. On the contrary, a hieratic treatment is most suitable if it be possible. But to be genuine it must be traditional, it must have grown up with art itself. Now the only such tradition[1] which we have, is that *toga*-like dress just named as belonging to certain personages, which is excellent for single figures, and even for groups where there is little motion, but where much action has to be represented it is out of the question, and we *must* find some other treatment. There are two courses open. Either we must leave all questions of costume entirely to the fancy of the artist, the result of which will be certainly fantastic, and most likely grotesque; or we must insist upon conformity with the usage of a specified period; and, but for recent experience to the contrary, one would have thought that there could not have been two opinions as to the proper period being that of the event represented. We do not want artists to be learned antiquaries, and to fritter away their power about trifling matters of detail. But now, with such books as exist, and are easily accessible, any one may,

[1] To which perhaps ought to be added the Italian manner of representing the Blessed Virgin, which has almost become hieratic.

without difficulty, obtain sufficient information about the dress and accessories of any period, to enable him to represent them sufficiently near for all artistic purposes. And it certainly is no greater task to "get up" the first century than the thirteenth.

Whilst giving this question of costume its due consideration, we ought to be careful not to exaggerate its importance; for after all, it is one of those little things which become great only in feeble hands. A master can by simple art-power reduce it to an insignificant detail. The anachronisms of a Raphael, or a Rubens, pass for nothing, because the sterling merit of their work is such, that points of mere costume and the like pass quite out of sight. But the average modern R.A. is far too weak to neglect the aid of antiquarian correctness with impunity. A first-rate picture will tell its tale in spite of such neglect, but a feeble one becomes a masquerade.

A good picture may here and there be found in our churches, but a fairly tolerable statue is a thing almost unknown. There are images of a sort, it is true, but they are nearly all the work of that class of mechanics known popularly as *art-manufacturers*, the generation of which has been the curse of the *Gothic* movement, and the existence of which continues to be the greatest obstacle in the way of a true art revival. And, even where an attempt has been made to obtain work of a better sort, the result has very rarely been successful. The fact is, that our sculptors are still blinded by the pseudo-Greek fog, from which architects escaped half a

century ago. The entire lesson of *true principles* has yet to be learned by them, and the most part of them seem not to know that there is such a thing as design in sculpture. They are mere modellers, putting manipulative skill in the place of art. And although fitness for its position, is a hundred times more necessary to a statue than it is to a painting, scarcely any of them appear ever to calculate the effect of their works anywhere, except in their own studios. If there is one quality more than another essential to a good statue, it is dignified repose; yet our sculptors persist in showing their cleverness by representing violent action, and draperies tossed about as by a high wind. One would have thought that the ridiculous appearance of such works, when placed in niches or upon pedestals, would be sufficient to prevent their repetition. But it is not so, for continually we see set up, not statues, but models of men, who look as if by some accident they had got into very uncomfortable positions, and were waiting in uneasy expectation of somebody coming with a ladder to release them. A *fidgety* statue[1] is both an offensive thing in itself, and injurious to the composition of which it forms a part, notwithstanding the anatomical knowledge which may be displayed upon it. The manufacturers, partly from want of skill and partly in imitation of mediæval sculpture, generally avoid this fault, so that often their work is less positively offensive than that of better men. But it is bad at the best.

[1] Like those in the reredos of the high altar at Westminster Abbey.

And for the present it will be well to avoid the use of statuary in our churches altogether, or at least to confine it to a very subordinate place in their design. Some of our sculptors can execute small reliefs prettily, and, where nothing higher than prettiness is required, they may sometimes be used.

The painting of statuary appears to have been practised more or less in all ages, and the mediæval artists carried it to a very great excess, as have also some of their modern imitators. It is, therefore, a matter which we should not pass over without notice.

There are two ways of painting a statue. It may either be painted up to as close a likeness as possible of the subject represented, or it may be conventionally coloured with reference to, but not in imitation of, its subject. The former, in spite of mediæval precedent, I have no hesitation in condemning altogether. Sculpture, like all fine arts, must excite the imagination. It must suggest something higher than is possible to be conveyed by a mechanical transcript. Even a rude and imperfect work which appeals to the imagination will give pleasure. But in a literal reproduction the spectator sees no more than lies before him. If it be badly done, the faults are very patent. And if anything like exactness of representation is reached, the work becomes shocking from its rigidity. But it does not follow that sculpture should never be painted. A statue or a group may, either of itself, or as part of a larger design, require colour, in which case let it be painted, but with taste

and discretion, not after the manner of waxwork. Figures approaching life-size require the most cautious treatment, and should, I think, never be entirely painted. But in smaller works, especially groups, colour may be used more freely. Indeed, a carved and painted panel may sometimes be used instead of a flat picture, because by it a richer colour may be obtained. But even then, although the sculpture is in a manner sacrificed to the architecture, and is necessarily at a considerable distance from the spectator, the colouring should be strictly conventional.

## *SECTION XXXIII.*

### OF THE SIZE AND COST OF CHURCHES.

A VOLUME might be written with this title, and with whole chapters on matters which I must now either pass over altogether, or but briefly touch, for there is so much that might be said, that I hardly know what to say, and what to omit, or what to begin with. Since about 1820, there has been going on a perpetual subdivision of parishes and consequent multiplication of parish churches, the policy of which this is not the place to dispute, though I certainly agree with those who hold, that *in towns* it would be better economy to have a few large churches, each served by a numerous staff of clergy, and supplemented where necessary with dependent chapels, rather than, as now, a number of small buildings, whose very look suggests poverty, and each with its vicar working single-handed, or at best with the assistance of one curate. But, assuming that in any case a new church ought to be built. Then, first of all come the questions—How large ought it to be? and how much ought to be spent upon it? Now these questions have two sides, which may be called respectively the clerical side, and the lay or general side. And very often a building will excite our respect or our contempt,

according as we take the one or the other view. For reasons which we need not now stop to examine, church-building ceased in England about the middle of the sixteenth century, and for nearly three hundred years, during which the population continued to increase, the increase in the number of churches was so small as to be insignificant, whilst at the same time, the usefulness of those there were was very greatly reduced by the growth of the private pew system. And even now, in spite of what has been done during the last fifty years, both in the building of new churches, and the throwing open of the old, the church accommodation is still far below the needs of the people. There are hundreds of places where people are lapsing into schism or heathenism, simply because there is no church for them. Where such is the case, nobody knows it so well, or feels it so much, as the parson himself, who is possibly blessed with a magnificent income of £300 a year, out of which it is obvious he can build no new church, however much he may be convinced of the necessity of one. What, then, can he do? He tries to get some other people interested in the matter, but they do not see it as he does; one gives a small subscription, and another a small subscription, and at last, after a great deal of begging and scraping, the anxiety and labour of which ought not to have been thrown upon the parson at all, two or three thousand pounds are got together. Mr Flick is called upon to furnish a design, and in due time there rises what the newspapers are pleased to call a "neat

Gothic edifice," and our friend the parson has at length the satisfaction of seeing the hitherto neglected district, with its own church, incumbent, churchwardens, and the whole parochial machinery, complete. Now, after all the trouble and unpleasantness which he has had about it, it is surely hard for the good man to be told that his work is contemptible. To have placed a church and a priest in a neighbourhood, where before even a Methodist meeting-house would have been a blessing, is surely no small thing. The work certainly is *not* contemptible—but the building may be.

Now let us look at the matter from the other point of view. Any shed reasonably well lighted, and large enough, will serve the purpose of a church, and where no better can be had, its use as such is both lawful and praiseworthy. But a community of Christian men living comfortably, each in his own station of life, ought to be ashamed either to build, or to allow to be built in their midst, a church, of which no better can be said than that it serves its purpose. Even taking no higher view than that the church is the chief public building in the parish, men's pride should prevent their suffering it to be worse than the best they can make it. And that it is not so, is, I am convinced, to be accounted for by the meeting-house view of the church, and by the concomitant abuse of the private pew system, which have made men cease to regard the church as a public building at all. They see in it not the open temple of God, towards, and in which, all the parishioners have without

distinction equal duties and equal rights, but the private meeting-house of the few—limited to the number which the church will hold at one time—to whom the seats are parcelled out.[1] It is quite natural for them to argue, that the building should be cared for by those for whose use it is reserved. And, although the abuse which caused it has happily now been removed in many places, the feeling still remains, and will remain for many years yet to come. Indeed, it cannot wear out until the removal of the cause is general, instead of, as now, only partial. Meanwhile we must be content to regard our churches as congregational, rather than parochial, and the better a church is worked, the more nearly will it approach to its parochial status. But even with this limitation, the majority of our modern parish churches are most mean and paltry in comparison with what they ought to be, and what the congregations could well afford to make them.

Now, I believe that in nine cases out of ten, it is not the stinginess of the congregation, but the timidity of its first projectors, which is to blame for the shabbiness of a new church. Most men are quite ready to admit in the abstract, that considering its high purposes a church ought to be a magnificent building, and I do

[1] It does not make a pin of difference whether money is received for the pews or not. It is strange that men will not see that the compromise called, "free but appropriated," has all the disadvantages of the letting-out system, without its one advantage of being a reliable source of income. If private individuals do "appropriate" what belongs to the public, they ought at least to be made to pay heavily for it.

not think that they are now less willing to contribute of their substance to make it so, than they were in the Middle Ages,[1] whilst since then, wealth has greatly increased, and the cost of building is much less than it then was. But the fact is, that they are asked for little, and they give little. A poor church is built merely because it is imagined that money cannot be found to make it any better, and, once built, its very meanness prevents its being improved, because it prevents people from taking any personal interest in it. For, compare the sums which are raised by subscription and spent—whether well or ill is not now the question—upon the old churches, which men do take an interest in. I know an instance, where, in a town of no great size, in about twelve years, between £20,000 and £30,000 has been spent not in rebuilding, but in *repairing and refurnishing* the old parish church, and now they have begun to fill the windows with painted glass, upon which many thousands more will be spent; yet in the very same town, there are several modern churches,

[1] There is a popular opinion that all old churches were built by powerful magnates or rich corporations, as indeed monastic and collegiate churches often were. But the parish churches were built and furnished very much as they are now "by subscription." And a fine church indicates not so often a rich benefactor, as a generally prosperous community. It is also commonly believed that building was formerly much cheaper than now. The old accounts which remain seem to show that, proportionally to the value of money, wages were then higher than at present; whilst for material, the mere cost of carriage must have been enormous; and it was sometimes brought from long distances; for instance, much of the stone at Westminster Abbey comes from Dorsetshire and Yorkshire, and the nearest, I believe, from Reigate.

which have scarcely received the least addition since they were consecrated, and which still want all but the most necessary furniture. This is no isolated case. All over England there may be noticed the same contrast, between the sums collected and spent upon repairing and altering old churches, and what is spent upon the new. What man, even in our wealthiest towns, ever thinks of asking for £30,000 for a new church, yet that is no unusual sum to be spent upon an old one. Kirkstall Abbey Church is not large,[1] compared with some of our old town parish churches, or with what our new ones ought to be, and might be, and though it is roofless, all its walls remain. When a few months ago the idea was started of rescuing it from its present desecrated condition, the promoters of the scheme did not begin by inquiring how cheaply they could get the place roofed, and put into a just useable state of repair. If they had done so they would probably have been laughed at. But they went to an architect in whose opinion they had confidence, and asked him what he thought ought to be done, and what would be the probable cost of doing it. The estimate was £34,250,[2] which appears to have included nothing for lighting or warming, and except a provision of £250 for chairs, nothing for furniture of any kind to the nave or public

[1] It is little over 200 feet long, and about 60 feet between the aisle walls.

[2] See Sir Gilbert Scott's report, which was printed in the *Architect* newspaper, for July 12, 1873, and in many other papers about that date.

part of the building. Now in spite of the strong protests which have been made against this "restoration," I have no doubt at all, that if a beginning is made, the money will be found without difficulty. But of all the new churches which have been built in Leeds within the last twenty years, I wonder how many there are which have cost even half £34,250.

It may be argued that men are willing to spend more upon old churches than on new, simply because they are old, and because of the historical associations which cluster round them. Perhaps. But if so, it is curious that, in the greatest number of cases, they should testify their respect and appreciation of antiquity, by the careful removal of all evidence of it, and by making the buildings look as much like new ones as possible. I do not think respect for antiquity has anything to do with the matter. Indeed, the support given to the few modern churches, such as St George's, Doncaster, which have been begun in a really munificent spirit, seems to settle the question. Men will subscribe largely to an important work for its own sake, and for the personal interest which they take in it; but to a barely necessary work, they give a few pounds as it were an alms, just as they would to a blanket fund or any other parochial charity, and perhaps with a vague idea that they are conferring a benefit, or at least a favour, on the parson. Again, a good church, when built, creates an interest in itself, and constantly receives gifts of additional ornaments or furniture; whereas, a poor building is likely to

continue in its original poverty. Simply as a matter of policy, then, it seems to me, that the initiators of a new church ought to be very careful not to fall into the error of asking for too little. *Parsimony does not pay.* The commonest and one of the most mistaken forms of parsimony is to build churches too small; whence that unseemly and inconvenient over-crowding of them with pews, as if their only purpose was to *hold* the congregation. This is sometimes caused by the conviction, which many men have, that people cannot hear a sermon in a large church, a conviction which continues to flourish, notwithstanding the existence of many large *old* churches in which people do hear sermons often better than they can in modern small buildings. Even granting, which I do not, that there must be no nook or corner in a church from which the preacher cannot be heard,[1] we have plenty of examples to teach us that we need not be afraid to build very much larger than is now done. The question is one of good or bad management, rather than of size. Of course local circumstances must always regulate the actual dimensions of a building. What would be a very large church in a country village would be—or I may say *is*, for it is a thing of daily experience—ridiculously small in a populous town. For village churches we cannot do better than to follow the rule which appears to have guided the mediæval church builders, namely, let them be capable of holding any

[1] Although we do not use them so, we are far too apt to think of our churches as if they were exclusively preaching-places.

probable congregation, with plenty of room to spare. But in towns, the disproportion between the population and the church accommodation is such, that it is quite impossible to follow the same rule; let us, however, approach as near as we can to it. A town church ought at least to be seated for 800, and be able to contain 1200 on occasions. It seems hardly worth while to provide a new parochial organisation for less. And again, whatever be its position, a church ought to be noble and dignified in appearance, which it cannot be, if it be closely surrounded by buildings larger and higher than itself, as a small building always must be in a modern town. A new town church, therefore, even though it be not so large on plan, ought to be larger in general *scale* than most of the old ones are. Here and there may be seen instances where this has been acknowledged and acted upon, but St Alban's, Holborn, and St Columba's, Haggarston, ought to rank as small churches in London. Indeed, in London and other of our largest towns, I believe it is almost impossible to build churches too large. If a church be well worked, its size will never be found excessive. How often do we see children, who have come in of their own accord, turned out to make way for adults, because the church is full, or in other words, because it is too small? The bad policy, as well as bad Christianity of this, I need not enlarge upon. And the common custom of banishing children to a school-room service, at the times when the chief services are going on in the parish church, is very little better.

Both are flagrant abuses due to no other cause than the inadequate size of the churches.

The cost of churches has always, and must always vary greatly, independently of their size, and although we have had no very large churches built in recent times, we have had a few, which for their size have been very costly. There are cases where £50, or even more *per* sitting[1] has been spent, but they are rare. The great majority have cost from £5 to £10 *per* sitting; we do indeed hear of churches at £4 and even at £3, but when seen they are nearly always found to be unfit to be called churches at all, every consideration of decency and convenience in performing the service being sacrificed, in order to increase the nominal "accommodation." From £10 to £12 per sitting is, I think, a fair estimating price for an ordinary, well-appointed, but unpretentious parish church, exclusive of the tower. Much more may be spent with advantage, but in the first outlay money will be better laid out in additional size than in increased proportional cost. Further ornaments can be added at any time, but it is not always convenient to add to the size of a building, and the *scale* fixed at the beginning must always give its character.

[1] "*Per* sitting" is the popular way of estimating, and the one most easily understood; I therefore use it here in spite of the many objections to it. A better way is to calculate by square feet of area. A "sitting" ought to be equivalent to from nine to ten feet in the total internal area. The church building societies say seven feet exclusive of the chancel, which is rather a small allowance, and the omission of the chancel from the calculation tends to encourage its undue curtailment.

There are, I know, places where churches are terribly necessary, and where the impossibility of raising any such sum as is implied by £10 or £12 *per* sitting is no timid fancy, but a very painful reality. Populous manufacturing villages, where the only wealthy resident is the mill-owner: a political dissenter, who objects to schools on principle, and who holds that his duty towards his neighbour begins and ends in paying his proportion of the rates, and subscribing an annual guinea to the nearest infirmary; whilst the landlord lives so far away that the idea of his tenants being his neighbours never suggests itself to him. In such places, cheap churches are not only justifiable but necessary; the mischief is, that men will not accept the conditions of them. They will try with their paltry £5, or even less, to make as much show as their rich neighbours with £25. The consequence is, that the cheap church is generally a gimcrack affair, with badly-built walls, a weak roof, insufficient chancel and vestry, and almost without sanctuary, the whole furnished in the most mean and meagre fashion, but decked out with useless mouldings and trashy carving, and as often as not with a kind of pinnacle, by courtesy a tower and spire, placed on one side, in order that people may not see how little it surpasses the gables in height. The affectation of mediævalism is more especially out of place in a poor building, because all complication of plan, and all sacrifice of straightforward construction to the supposed exigencies of style, add very much to the cost.

A respectable church can be built really very cheaply, if men, instead of struggling for "Gothicness" and "correctness," will remember that the simplest must necessarily be the cheapest, and ask no more than that it shall be substantial, decent, and convenient.[1] And in appearance such a church is infinitely preferable to a shabby-genteel imitation of an expensive building.

Temporary churches are sometimes recommended, but I think that they are a mistake, unless they are really temporary, and only meant for use whilst the permanent church is being built. For a church ought to be such that men can take an interest in it; and it is impossible to raise an interest in a building which it is intended to remove as soon as a suitable opportunity occurs. There is, however, no reason why part of a church should not be temporary. For instance, if money cannot be raised to do more well, a chancel may be built, which is quite enough to give a fixed interest, and to receive such improvements and adornments as that interest will produce; whilst a temporary nave will serve for use till the time comes for building the permanent one. Indeed, sometimes it would be much the best to spread the cost in this way over a considerable period; for so, in many cases, there might be built really fine churches, such as it would be quite impossible to raise in the same places by single efforts. Just as now, by taking them in parts, very large sums

[1] I am building one now which, I think, will not cost more than £4 *per* sitting.

are obtained for the "restoration" of our old churches. In fact, there is no way more likely to excite a real interest in what is going on, than to make the work worth noticing, and to spread it over a number of years. And let it always be remembered, that the better a work is begun the more men will support it.

A church may be furnished, as well as built, by degrees; but it ought never to be without its essential furniture, temporary if not permanent. For instance, let there always be a screen, if it be no more than a dozen wood bars and a few panels. Let all temporary furniture be decent, not tawdry, sufficient for its purpose, and without ornament; especially let there be none of these substitutes for ornament, which seem to be considered legitimate in temporary work, where they would not be allowed in permanent. Besides its usefulness, the existence of a temporary piece of furniture will often suggest the gift of a permanent, where, but for it, it would not have been thought of.

---

This ends what I have to say on modern parish churches; perhaps some day I may say something about old ones. Now, I cannot better conclude than with a comparison between them, suggested by the last paragraphs. We see what our old churches are—those, at least, of them which have not been made new by "restoration." Now, wherein lies their charm, and is there any hope of our modern buildings ever acquiring

it? The secret is, I take it, no more than this, that the old church-builders, and all church-builders until the invention of "correctness," worked *naturally*. Whatever they did, or whatever alteration they made, was done to suit their own actual wants, or their sense of propriety, and in the manner in which they were accustomed to work, and which was natural to them. And so, even where their changes were not improvements, they always have, at least, historical interest. But now we drown Nature in the affectations of mediævalism and "period." Our works are academical studies, not spontaneous compositions. An architect of taste and ability may, by the modern system, produce an imposing, and even a beautiful building; but rarely one which touches the affections. We see it, admire it, and have done. We never *love* it, as we do the old; because it is dead and does not speak to us. As if to show us that it is not mere antiquity which gives this charm, there are a very few modern buildings which have it. Let us then not despair, as some have done. We may study the works of the past, and imitate them—*i.e.*, their spirit, not their letter—but, if ever again we are to have a real living architecture, we must, before all things, BE NATURAL.

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE AND COMPANY
EDINBURGH AND LONDON

*September*, 1875.

# AN ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF

# HENRY S. KING & CO.'S

# PUBLICATIONS.

*Cornhill, and 12 Paternoster Row, London,*
*September, 1875.*

# A LIST OF

# S. KING & CO.'S

# JBLICATIONS.

. M.A.

**D FOREST RAMBLES OF A NATURALIST IN SWICK.** With Notes and Observations on the ry of Eastern Canada. 8vo., cloth. Illustrated. 14*s.*

O.), H.B.M.'s Secretary of Embassy at y H.B.M.'s Chargé d'Affaires, and Secretary of edo.

**STORY OF JAPAN.** From the Earliest Period to the me. New Edition, revised. Demy 8vo. In 2 vols. s and Plans. 21*s.* each.

. Davenport, Jun.)

**S OF LOVE,** from Shakespeare to Tennyson. Selected ged by. Fcap. 8vo., cloth extra, gilt edges, 3*s.* 6*d.*

**OUGH STORM AND SUNSHINE.** Illustrated by M. E. s, A. T. H. Paterson, and the Author. 1 vol. Crown 8vo.

. B.

**COTCH COMMUNION SUNDAY,** to which are added Cer- Discourses from a University City. By the Author of Recreations of a Country Parson." Second Edition. 1 8vo. 5*s.*

ALLEN (Rev. R.), M.A.

**ABRAHAM: HIS LIFE, TIMES, AND TRAVELS**, as told by a Contemporary 3800 years ago. Post 8vo., with Map. Cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.*

AMOS (Sheldon).

**THE SCIENCE OF LAW.** Crown 8vo. 5*s.*
Being Vol. X. of the International Scientific Series.

ANDERSON (Rev. Charles), M.A.

**CHURCH THOUGHT AND CHURCH WORK.** Edited by. Containing articles by the Revs. J. M. Capes, Professor Cheetham, J. Ll. Davis, Harry Jones, Brooke, Lambert, A. J. Ross, the Editor, and others. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

**WORDS AND WORKS IN A LONDON PARISH.** Edited by. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 6*s.*

**THE CURATE OF SHYRE.** Demy 8vo. Cloth. 7*s.* 6*d.*

ANDERSON (Colonel R. P.)

**VICTORIES AND DEFEATS.** An Attempt to explain the Causes which have led to them. An Officer's Manual. Demy 8vo. 14*s.*

ANSON (Lieut.-Col. The Hon. A.), V.C., M.P.

**THE ABOLITION OF PURCHASE AND THE ARMY REGULATION BILL OF 1871.** Crown 8vo. 1*s.*

**ARMY RESERVES AND MILITIA REFORMS.** Crown 8vo. 1*s.*

**THE STORY OF THE SUPERSESSIONS.** Crown 8vo. 6*d.*

**ARMY OF THE NORTH GERMAN CONFEDERATION.** A Brief Description of its Organization, of the Different Branches of the Service and their *rôle* in War, of its Mode of Fighting, etc., etc. Translated from the Corrected Edition, by permission of the author, by Colonel Edward Newdegate. Demy 8vo. 5*s.*

ARGYLE (Duke of).

**SPEECHES ON THE SECOND READING OF THE CHURCH PATRONAGE (SCOTLAND) BILL IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS,** June 2, 1874; and Earl of Camperdown's Amendment, June 9, 1874, placing the Election of Ministers in the hands of Ratepayers. Crown 8vo. Sewed. 1*s.*

ASHANTEE WAR (The).

A Popular Narrative. By the Special Correspondent of the "Daily News." Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

ASHE (T.) Author of "The Sorrows of Hypsipyle."

**EDITH; OR, LOVE AND LIFE IN CHESHIRE.** Sewed. 6*d.*

ASHTON (John).

**ROUGH NOTES OF A VISIT TO BELGIUM, SEDAN, AND PARIS,** in September, 1870–71. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

AURORA: A Volume of Verse. 5*s.*

AUTHOR of "St. Olave's," "When I was a Little Girl," etc.

**AUNT MARY'S BRAN PIE.** Illustrated. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**SUMMER STORIES FOR WINTER NIGHTS.** Fcap. 8vo. Illustrated. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Being two of Henry S. King and Co.'s Three and Sixpenny Series of Children's Books.

BAGEHOT (Walter).

**PHYSICS AND POLITICS**; or, Thoughts on the Application of the Principles of "Natural Selection" and "Inheritance" to Political Society. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 4*s.*
Volume II. of the International Scientific Series.

**THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION.** A New Edition, Revised and Corrected, with an Introductory Dissertation on Recent Changes and Events. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

**LOMBARD STREET.** A Description of the Money Market. Crown 8vo. Sixth Edition. 7*s.* 6*d.*

BAIN (Alexander), LL.D.

**MIND AND BODY.** The Theories of their Relation. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 4*s.*
Volume IV. of the International Scientific Series.

BANKS (Mrs. G. Linnæus).

**GOD'S PROVIDENCE HOUSE.** Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*
One of the volumes of the Cornhill Library of Fiction.

BARLEE (Ellen).

**LOCKED OUT**; A Tale of the Strike. With a Frontispiece. 1*s.* 6*d.*

BAYNES (Rev. Canon R. H.), Editor of "Lyra Anglicana," etc.

**HOME SONGS FOR QUIET HOURS.** Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. Cloth extra, 3*s.* 6*d.*

*** *This may also be had handsomely bound in Morocco with gilt edges.*

BECKER (Bernard H.)

**SCIENTIFIC LONDON.** 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

BENNETT (Dr. W. C.).

**SONGS FOR SAILORS.** Dedicated by Special Request to H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.* With Steel Portrait and Illustrations.
An Edition in Illustrated Paper Covers, 1*s.*

**BABY MAY.** Home Poems and Ballads. With Frontispiece. Cloth elegant. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

**BABY MAY AND HOME POEMS.** Fcap. 8vo. Sewed in Coloured Wrapper. 1*s.*

**NARRATIVE POEMS AND BALLADS.** Fcap. 8vo. Sewed in Coloured Wrapper. 1*s.*

BENNIE (Rev. Jas. Noble), M.A.

**THE ETERNAL LIFE.** Sermons preached during the last twelve years. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

BERNARD (Bayle).

**SAMUEL LOVER, THE LIFE AND UNPUBLISHED WORKS OF.** In 2 vols. Post 8vo. With a Steel Portrait. 21*s.*

BETHAM-EDWARDS (Miss M.)

**KITTY.** Crown 8vo. With a Frontispiece. 3*s.* 6*d.*
One of the volumes of the Cornhill Library of Fiction.

**MADEMOISELLE JOSEPHINE'S FRIDAYS, AND OTHER STORIES.** Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

BLUME (Major William).

**THE OPERATIONS OF THE GERMAN ARMIES IN FRANCE,** from Sedan to the end of the war of 1870–71. With Map. From the Journals of the Head-quarters Staff. Translated by the late E. M. Jones, Maj. 20th Foot, Prof. of Mil. Hist., Sandhurst. Demy 8vo. 9*s.*

BLANC (Henry), M.D.

**CHOLERA: HOW TO AVOID AND TREAT IT.** Popular and Practical Notes. Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

BOGUSLAWSKI (Captain A. von).

**TACTICAL DEDUCTIONS FROM THE WAR OF 1870-71.** Translated by Colonel Lumley Graham, late 18th (Royal Irish) Regiment. Third Edition, Revised and Corrected. Demy 8vo. 7*s.*

A volume of Henry S. King and Co.'s Series of Military Works.

BONWICK (James).

**THE TASMANIAN LILY.** Cr. 8vo. With Frontispiece. 5*s.*

**MIKE HOWE, THE BUSHRANGER OF VAN DIEMEN'S LAND.** Crown 8vo. With Frontispiece. 5*s.*

BOSWELL (R. B.), M.A., Oxon.

**METRICAL TRANSLATIONS FROM THE GREEK AND LATIN POETS,** and other Poems. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

BOTHMER (Countess Von).

**CRUEL AS THE GRAVE.** A Novel. 3 vols.

BOWRING (L.), C.S.I., Lord Canning's Private Secretary, and for many years Chief Commissioner of Mysore and Coorg.

**EASTERN EXPERIENCES.** Illustrated with Maps and Diagrams. Demy 8vo. 16*s.*

BRAVE MEN'S FOOTSTEPS. By the Editor of "Men who have Risen." A Book of Example and Anecdote for Young People. With Four Illustrations by C. Doyle. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

BRIALMONT (Colonel A.)

**HASTY INTRENCHMENTS.** Translated by Lieut. Charles A. Empsom, R.A. With nine Plates. Demy 8vo. 6*s.*

BRIEFS AND PAPERS. Being Sketches of the Bar and the Press. By Two Idle Apprentices. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

BROOKE (Rev. Stopford A.), M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty the Queen.

**THE LATE REV. F. W. ROBERTSON, M.A., LIFE AND LETTERS OF.** Edited by Stopford Brooke, M.A.

I. In 2 vols., uniform with the Sermons. Steel Portrait. 7*s.* 6*d.*
II. Library Edition. 8vo. Two Steel Portraits. 12*s.*
III. A Popular Edition, in 1 vol. 8vo. 6*s.*

BROOKE (Rev. Stopford A.), M.A.

**THEOLOGY IN THE ENGLISH POETS.**—COWPER, COLERIDGE, WORDSWORTH, and BURNS. Second Edition. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

**CHRIST IN MODERN LIFE.** Sermons Preached in St. James's Chapel, York Street, London. Eighth Edition. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

**FREEDOM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.** Six Sermons suggested by the Voysey Judgment. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**SERMONS** Preached in St. James's Chapel, York Street, London. Eighth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

**SERMONS** Preached in St. James's Chapel, York Street, London. Second Series. By the Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7*s.*

**FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE**: The Life and Work of. A Memorial Sermon. Crown 8vo. Sewed. 1*s.*

BROOKE (W. G.), M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Author of "Six Privy Council Judgments," &c.

**THE PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION ACT.** With a Classified Statement of its Provisions, Notes, and Index. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**SIX PRIVY COUNCIL JUDGMENTS—1850-1872.** Annotated by. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

BROWN (Rev. J. Baldwin), B.A., Author of "First Principles of Ecclesiastical Truth," etc.

**THE HIGHER LIFE.** Its Reality, Experience, and Destiny. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

**THE DOCTRINE OF ANNIHILATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL OF LOVE.** Five Discourses by the Rev. J. Baldwin Brown, B.A., Author of "The Higher Life," etc. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

BROWNE (Rev. Marmaduke E.)

**UNTIL THE DAY DAWN.** Four Advent Lectures delivered in the Episcopal Chapel, Milverton, Warwickshire, on the Sunday evenings during Advent, 1870. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

BRYANT (William Cullen).

**POEMS.** Red-line Edition. Handsomely bound. With 24 Illustrations and Portrait of the Author. 7*s.* 6*d.*

A Cheaper Edition, with Frontispiece. 3*s.* 6*d.*

BUCHANAN (Robert).

**POETICAL WORKS.** Collected Edition, in 3 Vols., price 6*s.* each.

Vol. I.—"Ballads and Romances;" "Ballads and Poems of Life," and a Portrait of the Author.

Vol. II.—"Ballads and Poems of Life;" "Allegories and Sonnets."

Vol. III.—"Cruiskeen Sonnets;" "Book of Orm;" "Political Mystics."

**MASTER-SPIRITS.** Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

BULKELEY (Rev. Henry J.)

**WALLED IN,** and other Poems. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

BUNNÈTT (F. E.)

**LEONORA CHRISTINA, MEMOIRS OF,** Daughter of Christian IV. of Denmark; Written during her Imprisonment in the Blue Tower of the Royal Palace at Copenhagen, 1663-1685. Translated by F. E. Bunnètt. With an Autotype Portrait of the Princess. Medium 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

**LINKED AT LAST.** 1 vol. Crown 8vo.

**UNDER A CLOUD; OR, JOHANNES OLAF.** By E. D. Wille. Translated by F. E. Bunnètt. 3 vols.

BURTON (Mrs. Richard).

**THE INNER LIFE OF SYRIA, PALESTINE, AND THE HOLY LAND.** 2 vols. Demy 8vo. 24*s.*

BUTLER (Josephine E.)

**JOHN GREY (of Dilston): MEMOIRS.** By his Daughter. New and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

CAMDEN (Charles).

**HOITY TOITY, THE GOOD LITTLE FELLOW.** With Eleven Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**THE TRAVELLING MENAGERIE.** By Charles Camden, Author of "Hoity Toity." With Ten Illustrations by J. Mahoney. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The above form part of Henry S. King & Co.'s Three and Sixpenny Series of Children's Books.

CARLISLE (A. D.), B.A., Trin. Coll., Camb.

**ROUND THE WORLD IN 1870.** A Volume of Travels, with Maps. New Edition. Demy 8vo. 6*s.*

CARNE (Miss E. T.)

**THE REALM OF TRUTH.** Crown 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

CARPENTER (E.)

**NARCISSUS AND OTHER POEMS.** Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

CARPENTER (W. B.), LL.D., M.D., F.R.S., etc.

**THE PRINCIPLES OF MENTAL PHYSIOLOGY.** With their Applications to the Training and Discipline of the Mind, and the Study of its Morbid Conditions. 8vo. Illustrated. 12*s.*

CARR (Lisle).

**JUDITH GWYNNE.** 3 vols. Crown 8vo. Second Edition.

CHAPMAN, M. F.

**A SCOTCH WOOING.** 2 vols. Crown 8vo.

CHRISTOPHERSON (The late Rev. Henry), M.A., Assistant Minister at Trinity Church, Brighton.

**SERMONS.** Crown 8vo. Cloth. 7*s.* 6*d.* With an Introduction by John Rae, LL.D., F.S.A.

CLAYTON (Cecil).

**EFFIE'S GAME; HOW SHE LOST AND HOW SHE WON.** A Novel. 2 vols.

CLERK (Mrs. Godfrey), Author of "The Antipodes and Round the World."

**'ILAM EN NAS.** Historical Tales and Anecdotes of the Times of the Early Khalifahs. Translated from the Arabic Originals. Illustrated with Historical and Explanatory Notes. Crown 8vo. 7*s.*

CLERY (C.), Captain 32nd Light Infantry, Professor of Tactics Royal Military College, Sandhurst.

**MINOR TACTICS.** Demy 8vo. With 26 Plans. 16*s.*

CLODD (Edward), F.R.A.S.

**THE CHILDHOOD OF THE WORLD:** a Simple Account of Man in Early Times. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*s.*
A Special Edition for Schools. 1*s.*

**THE CHILDHOOD OF RELIGIONS.** Including a Simple Account of the Birth and Growth of Myths and Legends. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

COLERIDGE (Sara).

**PRETTY LESSONS IN VERSE FOR GOOD CHILDREN,** with some Lessons in Latin, in Easy Rhyme. A New Edition. Illustrated. 3*s.* 6*d.*

COLERIDGE (Sara).

**PHANTASMION.** A Fairy Romance. With an Introductory Preface by the Right Hon. Lord Coleridge of Ottery St. Mary. A New Edition. Illustrated. *7s. 6d.*

**MEMOIR AND LETTERS OF SARA COLERIDGE.** Edited by her Daughter. Third Edition, Revised and Corrected. With Index. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. With Two Portraits. *24s.*
Cheap Edition. With one Portrait. *7s. 6d.*

COLLINS (Mortimer).

**THE PRINCESS CLARICE.** A Story of 1871. 2 vols.

**SQUIRE SILCHESTER'S WHIM.** By Mortimer Collins, Author of "Marquis and Merchant," etc. 3 vols.

**MIRANDA.** A Midsummer Madness. 3 vols.

**THE INN OF STRANGE MEETINGS, AND OTHER POEMS.** Crown 8vo. *5s.*

**THE SECRET OF LONG LIFE.** Dedicated by special permission to Lord St. Leonard's. Fourth Edition. Large crown 8vo. *5s.*

COLLINS (Rev. Richard), M.A.

**MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE IN THE EAST.** With special reference to the Syrian Christians of Malabar, and the results of modern Missions. With Four Illustrations. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

CONWAY (Moncure D.)

**REPUBLICAN SUPERSTITIONS.** Illustrated by the Political History of the United States. Including a Correspondence with M. Louis Blanc. Crown 8vo. *5s.*

CONYERS (Ansley).

**CHESTERLEIGH.** 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

COOKE (M. C.), M.A., LL.D.

**FUNGI**; their Nature, Influences, Uses, etc. Edited by the Rev. M. J. Berkeley, M.A., F.L.S. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. With Illustrations. *5s.*
Being Vol. XIV. of the International Scientific Series.

COOKE (Professor Josiah P.), of the Harvard University.

**THE NEW CHEMISTRY.** Second Edition. With Thirty-one Illustrations. *5s.*
Vol. IX. of the International Scientific Series.

COOPER (T. T.)

**THE MISHMEE HILLS**: an Account of a Journey made in an Attempt to Penetrate Thibet from Assam, to open New Routes for Commerce. Second Edition. With Four Illustrations and Map. Demy 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

CALDERON.

**CALDERON'S DRAMAS**: The Wonder-Working Magician—Life is a Dream—The Purgatory of St. Patrick. Translated by Denis Florence MacCarthy. Post 8vo. 10*s.*

CORNHILL LIBRARY OF FICTION, The. 3*s.* 6*d.* per Volume.

**HALF-A-DOZEN DAUGHTERS.** By J. Masterman.

**THE HOUSE OF RABY.** By Mrs. G. Hooper.

**A FIGHT FOR LIFE.** By Moy Thomas.

**ROBIN GRAY.** By Charles Gibbon.

**KITTY.** By Miss M. Betham-Edwards.

**HIRELL.** By John Saunders.

**ONE OF TWO**; or, The Left-Handed Bride. By J. Hain Friswell.

**READY-MONEY MORTIBOY.** A Matter-of-Fact Story.

**GOD'S PROVIDENCE HOUSE.** By Mrs. G. L. Banks.

**FOR LACK OF GOLD.** By Charles Gibbon.

**ABEL DRAKE'S WIFE.** By John Saunders.

COSMOS. A Poem. Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

SUBJECT.—Nature in the Past and in the Present—Man in the Past and in the Present—The Future.

COTTON (Robert Turner).

**MR. CARINGTON.** A Tale of Love and Conspiracy. 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

CURWEN (Henry).

**SORROW AND SONG**: Studies of Literary Struggle. Henry Mürger—Novalis—Alexander Petofi—Honoré de Balzac—Edgar Allan Poe—André Chénier. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 15*s.*

DAVIDSON (Samuel), D.D., LL.D.

**THE NEW TESTAMENT, TRANSLATED FROM THE LATEST GREEK TEXT OF TISCHENDORF.** Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

DAVIES (G. Christopher).

**MOUNTAIN, MEADOW, AND MERE**: a Series of Outdoor Sketches of Sport, Scenery, Adventures, and Natural History. With Sixteen Illustrations by Bosworth W. Harcourt. Crown 8vo. 6*s*.

**RAMBLES AND SCRAMBLES OF OUR SCHOOL FIELD CLUB; ITS ADVENTURES AND ACHIEVEMENTS.** A Book for Boys. Crown 8vo. 5*s*.

DAVIES (Rev. J. Llewelyn), M.A.

**THEOLOGY AND MORALITY.** Essays on Questions of Belief and Practice. Crown 8vo. 7*s*. 6*d*.

DE KERKADEC (Vicomtesse Solange).

**A CHEQUERED LIFE,** being Memoirs of the Vicomtesse de Leoville Meilhan. Edited by. Crown 8vo. 7*s*. 6*d*.

Containing many recollections of the First Emperor Napoleon and his Court.

DE L'HOSTE (Colonel E. P).

**THE DESERT PASTOR, JEAN JAROUSSEAU.** Translated from the French of Eugène Pelletan. In fcap. 8vo., with an Engraved Frontispiece. New Edition. 3*s*. 6*d*.

One of Henry S. King and Co.'s Three and Sixpenny Books for the Young.

DE LIEFDE (Jacob).

**THE GREAT DUTCH ADMIRALS.** Crown 8vo. With Eleven Illustrations by Townley Green and others. 5*s*.

One of Henry S. King and Co.'s Five Shilling Books for the Young.

DE REDCLIFFE (Viscount Stratford), P.C., K.G., G.C.B.

**WHY AM I A CHRISTIAN?** Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*s*.

DE TOCQUEVILLE (Alexis).

**CORRESPONDENCE AND CONVERSATIONS OF, WITH NASSAU WILLIAM SENIOR.** 2 vols. Post 8vo. 21*s*.

DE VERE (Aubrey).

**ALEXANDER THE GREAT.** A Dramatic Poem. Small crown 8vo. 5*s*.

**THE LEGENDS OF ST. PATRICK,** and other Poems. Small crown 8vo. 5*s*.

DE WILLE (E.)

**UNDER A CLOUD; OR, JOHANNES OLAF.** A Novel. Translated by F. E. Bunnètt. 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

DENNIS (John).

**ENGLISH SONNETS.** Collected and Arranged. Fcap. 8vo. Elegantly bound. 3*s.* 6*d.*

DOBSON (Austin).

**VIGNETTES IN RHYME AND VERS DE SOCIÉTÉ.** Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

DONNÉ (Alphonse), M.D.

**CHANGE OF AIR AND SCENE.** A Physician's Hints about Doctors, Patients, Hygiene, and Society; with Notes of Excursions for Health in the Pyrenees, and amongst the Watering-places of France (Inland and Seaward), Switzerland, Corsica, and the Mediterranean. A New Edition. Large post 8vo. 9*s.*

DOWDEN (Edward), LL.D.

**SHAKSPERE:** a Critical Study of his Mind and Art. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

DOWNTON (Rev. Henry), M.A.

**HYMNS AND VERSES.** Original and Translated. Small crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

DRAPER (John William), M.D., LL.D. Professor in the University of New York; Author of "A Treatise on Human Physiology."

**HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE.** Fourth Edition. 5*s.*
Vol. XIII. of the International Scientific Series.

DREW (Rev. G. S.), M.A., Vicar of Trinity, Lambeth.

**SCRIPTURE LANDS IN CONNECTION WITH THEIR HISTORY.** Second Edition. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

**NAZARETH: ITS LIFE AND LESSONS.** Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

**THE DIVINE KINGDOM ON EARTH AS IT IS IN HEAVEN.** 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

**THE SON OF MAN:** His Life and Ministry. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

DREWRY (G. Overend), M.D.

**THE COMMON-SENSE MANAGEMENT OF THE STOMACH.** Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

DURAND (Lady).

**IMITATIONS FROM THE GERMAN OF SPITTA AND TERSTEGEN.** Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.*

DU VERNOIS (Colonel von Verdy).

**STUDIES IN LEADING TROOPS.** An authorized and accurate Translation by Lieutenant H. J. T. Hildyard, 71st Foot. Parts I. and II. Demy 8vo. 7*s.*

This is one of Henry S. King and Co.'s Series of Military Works.

E. A. V.

**JOSEPH MAZZINI:** A Memoir. With Two Essays by Mazzini—"Thoughts on Democracy," and "The Duties of Man." Dedicated to the Working Classes by P. H. Taylor, M.P. Crown 8vo. With Two Portraits. 3*s.* 6*d.*

EDEN (Frederic).

**THE NILE WITHOUT A DRAGOMAN.** Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

EILOART (Mrs.)

**LADY MORETOUN'S DAUGHTER.** 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

ENGLISH CLERGYMAN.

**AN ESSAY ON THE RULE OF FAITH AND CREED OF ATHANASIUS.** Shall the Rubric preceding the Creed be removed from the Prayer-book? 8vo. Sewed. 1*s.*

EROS AGONISTES. Poems. By E. B. D. Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

EYRE (Maj.-Gen. Sir Vincent), C.B., K.C.S.I., etc.

**LAYS OF A KNIGHT-ERRANT IN MANY LANDS.** Square crown 8vo. With Six Illustrations. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Pharaoh Land. | Home Land. | Wonder Land. | Rhine Land.

FAITHFULL (Mrs. Francis G.)

**LOVE ME, OR LOVE ME NOT.** 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

FARQUHARSON (Martha).

I. **ELSIE DINSMORE.** Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

II. **ELSIE'S GIRLHOOD.** Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d*

III. **ELSIE'S HOLIDAYS AT ROSELANDS.** Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

These are volumes of Henry S. King and Co.'s Series of Three and Sixpenny Books for the Young.

FAVRE (Mons. Jules).

**THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENCE.** From the 30th June to the 31st October, 1870. The Plain Statement of a Member. 1 vol. Demy 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

FISHER (Alice).

**HIS QUEEN.** 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

FORBES (Archibald).

**SOLDIERING AND SCRIBBLING.** A Series of Sketches. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

FOTHERGILL (JESSIE).

**HEALEY.** A Romance. 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

FOWLE (Rev. T. W.), M.A.

**THE RECONCILIATION OF RELIGION AND SCIENCE.** Being Essays on Immortality, Inspiration, Miracles, and the Being of Christ. Demy 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

FRASER (Donald), Accountant to the British-Indian Steam Navigation Company, Limited.

**EXCHANGE TABLES OF STERLING AND INDIAN RUPEE CURRENCY,** upon a new and extended system, embracing Values from One Farthing to One Hundred Thousand Pounds, and at Rates progressing, in Sixteenths of a Penny, from 1*s.* 9*d.* to 2*s.* 3*d.* per Rupee. Royal 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

FRERE (Sir H. Bartle E.), G.C.B., G.C.S.I., etc.

**THE THREATENED FAMINE IN BENGAL;** How it may be Met, and the Recurrence of Famines in India Prevented. Being No. 1 of "Occasional Notes on Indian Affairs." Crown 8vo. With 3 Maps. 5*s.*

FRISWELL (J. Hain).

**THE BETTER SELF.** Essays for Home Life. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*
*Contents:*—Beginning at Home—The Girls at Home—The Wife's Mother—Pride in the Family—Discontent and Grumbling—Domestic Economy—On Keeping People Down—Likes and Dislikes—On Falling Out—Peace.

**ONE OF TWO;** or, The Left-Handed Bride. Crown 8vo. With a Frontispiece. 3*s.* 6*d.*
Being a Volume of the Cornhill Library of Fiction.

GARDNER (John), M.D.

**LONGEVITY; THE MEANS OF PROLONGING LIFE AFTER MIDDLE AGE.** Third Edition, revised and enlarged. Small crown 8vo. 4*s.*

GARRETT (Edward).

**BY STILL WATERS.** A Story for Quiet Hours. Crown 8vo. With Seven Illustrations. 6*s.*

GIBBON (Charles).

**FOR LACK OF GOLD.** Crown 8vo. With a Frontispiece. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**ROBIN GRAY.** Crown 8vo. With a Frontispiece. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The above Volumes form part of the Cornhill Library of Fiction.

GILBERT (Mrs.)

**MRS. GILBERT, FORMERLY ANN TAYLOR, AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND OTHER MEMORIALS OF.** Edited by Josiah Gilbert. In 2 vols. Post 8vo. With 2 Steel Portraits and several Wood Engravings. 24*s.*

GODKIN (James).

**THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF IRELAND:** Primitive, Papal, and Protestant. Including the Evangelical Missions, Catholic Agitations, and Church Progress of the last half Century. 1 vol. 8vo. 12*s.*

GODWIN (William).

**WILLIAM GODWIN:** his Friend's Contemporaries. By C. Kegan Paul. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. With Portraits.

**THE GENIUS OF CHRISTIANITY UNVEILED.** Being Essays never before published. Edited, with a Preface, by C. Kegan Paul. 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

GOETZE (Capt. A. von), Captain of the Prussian Corps of Engineers attached to the Engineer Committee, and Instructor at the Military Academy.

**OPERATIONS OF THE GERMAN ENGINEERS DURING THE WAR OF 1870-1871.** Published by Authority, and in accordance with Official Documents. Translated from the German by Colonel G. Graham, V.C., C.B., R.E. Demy 8vo. Cloth. With 6 large Maps. 21*s.*

GOODMAN (Walter).

**CUBA, THE PEARL OF THE ANTILLES.** Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

GOSSE (Edmund W.)

**ON VIOL AND FLUTE.** With Title-page specially designed by William B. Scott. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

GRANVILLE (A. B.), M.D., F.R.S., etc.

**AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A. B. GRANVILLE, F.R.S., etc.** Edited, with a brief account of the concluding years of his life, by his youngest Daughter, Paulina B. Granville. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. With a Portrait. 32*s.*

GRAY (Mrs. Russell).

**LISETTE'S VENTURE.** A Novel. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 21*s.*

GREEN (T. Bowden).

**FRAGMENTS OF THOUGHT.** Dedicated by permission to the Poet Laureate. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

GREENWOOD (James), "The Amateur Casual."

**IN STRANGE COMPANY**; or, The Note Book of a Roving Correspondent. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

GREY (John), of Dilston.

**JOHN GREY (of Dilston): MEMOIRS.** By Josephine E. Butler. New and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

GRIFFITH (Rev. T.), A.M., Prebendary of St. Paul's.

**STUDIES OF THE DIVINE MASTER.** Demy 8vo. 12*s.*

GRIFFITHS (Captain Arthur).

**THE QUEEN'S SHILLING.** A Novel. 2 vols. 21*s.*

**MEMORIALS OF MILLBANK, AND CHAPTERS IN PRISON HISTORY.** 2 vols. Post 8vo. 21*s.* With Illustrations.

GRUNER (M. L.)

**STUDIES OF BLAST FURNACE PHENOMENA.** Translated by L. D. B. Gordon, F.R.S.E., F.G.S. Demy 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

GURNEY (Rev. Archer Thompson).

**WORDS OF FAITH AND CHEER.** A Mission of Instruction and Suggestion. 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

**FIRST PRINCIPLES IN CHURCH AND STATE.** Demy 8vo. Sewed. 1*s.* 6*d.*

HAECKEL (Professor Ernst), of the University of Jena.

**THE HISTORY OF CREATION.** A Popular Account of the Development of the Earth and its Inhabitants, according to the Theories of Kant, Laplace, Lamarck, and Darwin. The Translation revised by E. Ray Lankester, M.A. With Coloured Plates and Genealogical Trees of the various groups of both plants and animals. 2 vols. Post 8vo.

**THE HISTORY OF THE EVOLUTION OF MAN.** Translated by E. A. Van Rhyn and L. Elsberg, M.D. (University of New York), with Notes and Additions sanctioned by the Author. Post 8vo.

HARCOURT (Capt. A. F. P.)

**THE SHAKESPEARE ARGOSY:** Containing much of the wealth of Shakespeare's Wisdom and Wit, alphabetically arranged and classified. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

HAWEIS (Rev. H. R.), M.A.

**SPEECH IN SEASON.** Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

**THOUGHTS FOR THE TIMES.** Eighth Edition. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

**UNSECTARIAN FAMILY PRAYERS,** for Morning and Evening for a Week, with short selected passages from the Bible. Square crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

HAWTHORNE (Julian).

**BRESSANT.** A Romance. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 21*s.*

**IDOLATRY.** A Romance. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 21*s.*

HAWTHORNE (Nathaniel).

**NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE.** A Memoir, with Stories now first published in this country. By H. A. Page. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

**SEPTIMUS.** A Romance. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

HAYMAN (Henry), D.D., late Head Master of Rugby School.

**RUGBY SCHOOL SERMONS.** With an Introductory Essay on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

HEATHERGATE. A Story of Scottish Life and Character. By a New Author. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 21*s.*

HELLWALD (Baron F. Von).

**THE RUSSIANS IN CENTRAL ASIA.** A Critical Examination, down to the present time, of the Geography and History of Central Asia. Translated by Lieut.-Col. Theodore Wirgman, LL.B. In 1 vol. Large post 8vo. With Map. 12*s.*

HELVIG (Captain Hugo).

**THE OPERATIONS OF THE BAVARIAN ARMY CORPS.** Translated by Captain G. S. Schwabe. With Five large Maps. In 2 vols. Demy 8vo. 24*s.*

This is one of Henry S. King and Co.'s Series of Military Books.

HINTON (James), late Aural Surgeon to Guy's Hospital.

**THE PLACE OF THE PHYSICIAN.** Being the Introductory Lecture at Guy's Hospital, 1873-74; to which is added ESSAYS ON THE LAW OF HUMAN LIFE, AND ON THE RELATION BETWEEN ORGANIC AND INORGANIC WORLDS. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

HINTON (JAMES).

**PHYSIOLOGY FOR PRACTICAL USE.** By various writers. Second Edition. With 50 Illustrations. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

**AN ATLAS OF DISEASES OF THE MEMBRANA TYMPANI.** With Descriptive Text. Post 8vo. £6 6*s.*

**THE QUESTIONS OF AURAL SURGERY.** Post 8vo. With Illustrations. 2 vols. 12*s.* 6*d.*

HOCKLEY (W. B.)

**TALES OF THE ZENANA**; or, A Nuwab's Leisure Hours. By the Author of "Pandurang Hari." With a Preface by Lord Stanley of Alderley. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 21*s.*

**PANDURANG HARI**; or, Memoirs of a Hindoo. A Tale of Mahratta Life sixty years ago. With a Preface by Sir H. Bartle E. Frere, G.C.S.I., etc. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 21*s.*

HOFFBAUER (Captain).

**THE GERMAN ARTILLERY IN THE BATTLES NEAR METZ.** Based on the official reports of the German Artillery. Translated by Capt. E. O. Hollist. Demy 8vo. With Map and Plans. 21*s.*

This is one of the volumes in Henry S. King and Co.'s Military Series.

HOLROYD (Captain W. R. M.), Bengal Staff Corps, Director of Public Instruction, Punjab.

**TAS-HIL UL KALAM**; or, Hindustani made Easy. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

HOOPER (Mrs. G.)

**THE HOUSE OF RABY.** With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

One of the volumes of the Cornhill Library of Fiction.

HOPE (Lieut. James).

**IN QUEST OF COOLIES.** With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

HOOPER (Mary).

**LITTLE DINNERS: HOW TO SERVE THEM WITH ELEGANCE AND ECONOMY.** Seventh Edition. 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

HOPKINS (Manley).

**THE PORT OF REFUGE**; or, Counsel and Aid to Shipmasters in Difficulty, Doubt, or Distress. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

HOWARD (Mary M.), Author of "Brampton Rectory."

**BEATRICE AYLMER, AND OTHER TALES.** Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

HOWARD (Rev. G. B.)

**AN OLD LEGEND OF ST. PAUL'S.** Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

HOWE (Cupples), Master Mariner.

**THE DESERTED SHIP.** A real story of the Atlantic. Illustrated by Townley Green. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

One of Henry S. King and Co.'s Three and Sixpenny Books for the Young.

HOWELL (James).

**A TALE OF THE SEA, SONNETS, AND OTHER POEMS.** Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

HUGHES (Allison).

**PENELOPE, AND OTHER POEMS.** Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

HULL (Edmund C. P.)

**THE EUROPEAN IN INDIA.** A Handbook of Practical Information for those proceeding to, or residing in, the East Indies, relating to Outfits, Routes, Time for Departure, Indian Climate, etc. With a MEDICAL GUIDE FOR ANGLO-INDIANS. By R. R. S. Mair, M.D., F.R.C.S.E., late Deputy Coroner of Madras. Second Edition, Revised and Corrected. In 1 vol. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

HUMPHREY (Rev. W.), of the Congregation of the Oblates of St. Charles.

**MR. FITZJAMES STEPHEN AND CARDINAL BELLARMINE.** Demy 8vo. Sewed. 1*s.*

HUTTON (James).

**MISSIONARY LIFE IN THE SOUTHERN SEAS.** With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

IGNOTUS.

**CULMSHIRE FOLK.** A Novel. New and Cheap Edition. In 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

INGELOW (Jean).

**THE LITTLE WONDER-HORN.** A Second Series of "Stories Told to a Child." With Fifteen Illustrations. Square 24mo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**OFF THE SKELLIGS.** (Her First Romance.) 4 vols. Crown 8vo. 42*s.*

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC SERIES (The).

I. **THE FORMS OF WATER IN CLOUDS AND RIVERS, ICE AND GLACIERS.** By J. Tyndall, LL.D., F.R.S. With 14 Illustrations. Fourth Edition. 5*s*.

II. **PHYSICS AND POLITICS**; or, Thoughts on the Application of the Principles of "Natural Selection" and "Inheritance" to Political Society. By Walter Bagehot. Third Edition. 4*s*.

III. **FOODS.** By Edward Smith, M.D., LL.B., F.R.S. Profusely Illustrated. Third Edition. 5*s*.

IV. **MIND AND BODY**: The Theories of their Relation. By Alexander Bain, LL.D. Third Edition. With Four Illustrations. 4*s*.

V. **THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY.** By Herbert Spencer. Fourth Edition. 5*s*.

VI. **ON THE CONSERVATION OF ENERGY.** By Balfour Stewart, M.D., LL.D., F.R.S. With 14 Engravings. Third Edition. 5*s*.

VII. **ANIMAL LOCOMOTION**; or, Walking, Swimming, and Flying. By J. B. Pettigrew, M.D., F.R.S. Second Edition. With 119 Illustrations. 5*s*.

VIII. **RESPONSIBILITY IN MENTAL DISEASE.** By Henry Maudsley, M.D. Second Edition. 5*s*.

IX. **THE NEW CHEMISTRY.** By Professor J. P. Cooke, of the Harvard University. Second Edition. With 31 Illustrations. 5*s*.

X. **THE SCIENCE OF LAW.** By Professor Sheldon Amos. Second Edition. 5*s*.

XI. **ANIMAL MECHANISM.** A Treatise on Terrestrial and Aerial Locomotion. By Professor E. J. Marey. With 117 Illustrations. Second Edition. 5*s*.

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC SERIES (The).

**XII. THE DOCTRINE OF DESCENT AND DARWINISM.** By Professor Oscar Schmidt (Strasburg University). Second Edition. With 26 Illustrations. 5*s.*

**XIII. THE HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE.** By Professor J. W. Draper. Fourth Edition. 5*s.*

**XIV. FUNGI**; their Nature, Influences, Uses, etc. By M. C. Cooke, M.A., LL.D. Edited by the Rev. M. J. Berkeley, M.A., F.L.S. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. With numerous Illustrations. 5*s.*

**XV. THE CHEMICAL EFFECTS OF LIGHT AND PHOTOGRAPHY.** By Dr. Hermann Vogel (Polytechnic Academy of Berlin). Second Edition. With 100 Illustrations. 5*s.*

**XVI. THE LIFE AND GROWTH OF LANGUAGE.** By William Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Yale College, New Haven. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

**XVII. MONEY AND THE MECHANISM OF EXCHANGE.** By Prof. W. Stanley Jevons. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

**XVIII. ANIMAL PARASITES AND MESSMATES.** By Monsieur Van Beneden, Professor of the University of Louvain, Correspondent of the Institute of France. Crown 8vo. With 83 Illustrations. 5*s.*

**XIX. THE NATURE OF LIGHT**: With a General Account of Physical Optics. By Dr. Eugene Lommel, Professor of Physics in the University of Erlangen. With 148 Illustrations and a Spectra in Chromolithography. 5*s.*

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC SERIES (The).

## *Forthcoming Volumes.*

Prof. W. KINGDON CLIFFORD, M.A. The First Principles of the Exact Sciences explained to the Non-mathematical.

Prof. T. H. HUXLEY, LL.D., F.R.S. Bodily Motion and Consciousness.

Dr. W. B. CARPENTER, LL.D., F.R.S. The Physical Geography of the Sea.

Prof. WILLIAM ODLING, F.R.S. The Old Chemistry viewed from the New Standpoint.

W. LAUDER LINDSAY, M.D., F.R.S.E. Mind in the Lower Animals.

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart., F.R.S. On Ants and Bees.

Prof. W. T. THISELTON DYER, B.A., B.Sc. Form and Habit in Flowering Plants.

Mr. J. N. LOCKYER, F.R.S. Spectrum Analysis.

Prof. MICHAEL FOSTER, M.D. Protoplasm and the Cell Theory.

H. CHARLTON BASTIAN, M.D., F.R.S. The Brain as an Organ of Mind.

Prof. A. C. RAMSAY, LL.D., F.R.S. Earth Sculpture: Hills, Valleys, Mountains, Plains, Rivers, Lakes; how they were Produced, and how they have been Destroyed.

Prof. RUDOLPH VIRCHOW (Berlin Univ.) Morbid Physiological Action.

Prof. CLAUDE BERNARD. History of the Theories of Life.

Prof. H. SAINTE-CLAIRE DEVILLE. An Introduction to General Chemistry.

Prof. WURTZ. Atoms and the Atomic Theory.

Prof. De QUATREFAGES. The Human Race.

Prof. LACAZE-DUTHIERS. Zoology since Cuvier.

Prof. BERTHELOT. Chemical Synthesis.

## INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC SERIES (The).

*(Forthcoming Volumes.)*

Prof. J. ROSENTHAL. General Physiology of Muscles and Nerves.

Prof. JAMES D. DANA, M.A., LL.D. On Cephalization; or, Head-Characters in the Gradation and Progress of Life.

Prof. S. W. JOHNSON, M.A. On the Nutrition of Plants.

Prof. AUSTIN FLINT, Jr. M.D. The Nervous System, and its Relation to the Bodily Functions.

Prof. BERNSTEIN (University of Halle). The Five Senses of Man.

Prof. FERDINAND COHN (Breslau Univ.) Thallophytes (Algæ, Lichens, Fungi).

Prof. HERMANN (University of Zurich). Respiration.

Prof. LEUCKART (University of Leipsic). Outlines of Animal Organization.

Prof. LIEBREICH (University of Berlin). Outlines of Toxicology.

Prof. KUNDT (University of Strasburg). On Sound.

Prof. REES (University of Erlangen). On Parasitic Plants.

Prof. STEINTHAL (University of Berlin). Outlines of the Science of Language.

P. BERT (Professor of Physiology, Paris). Forms of Life and other Cosmical Conditions.

E. ALGLAVE (Professor of Constitutional and Administrative Law at Douai, and of Political Economy at Lille). The Primitive Elements of Political Constitutions.

P. LORAIN (Professor of Medicine, Paris). Modern Epidemics.

Prof. SCHUTZENBERGER (Director of the Chemical Laboratory at the Sorbonne). On Fermentations.

Mons. FREIDEL. The Functions of Organic Chemistry.

Mons. DEBRAY. Precious Metals.

Prof. CORFIELD, M.A., M.D. (Oxon.) Air in its relation to Health.

Prof. A. GIARD. General Embryology.

JACKSON (T. G.)

**MODERN GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE.** Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

JACOB (Maj.-Gen. Sir G. Le Grand), K.C.S.I., C.B.

**WESTERN INDIA BEFORE AND DURING THE MUTINIES.** Pictures drawn from life. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

JENKINS (E.) and RAYMOND (J.), Esqs.

**A LEGAL HANDBOOK FOR ARCHITECTS, BUILDERS, AND BUILDING OWNERS.** Second Edition Revised. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

JENKINS (Rev. R. C.), M.A., Rector of Lyminge, and Honorary Canon of Canterbury.

**THE PRIVILEGE OF PETER,** Legally and Historically Examined, and the Claims of the Roman Church compared with the Scriptures, the Councils, and the Testimony of the Popes themselves. Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

JENKINS (Edward), M.P.

**GLANCES AT INNER ENGLAND.** A Lecture delivered in the United States and Canada. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

**GINX'S BABY:** His Birth and other Misfortunes. Thirty-fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 2*s.*

**LUCHMEE AND DILLO.** A Story of West Indian Life. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. Illustrated. [*Preparing.*

**LITTLE HODGE.** A Christmas Country Carol. Fourteenth Thousand. With Five Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*
A Cheap Edition in paper covers, price 1*s.*

**LORD BANTAM.** Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

JEVONS (Prof. W. Stanley).

**MONEY AND THE MECHANISM OF EXCHANGE.** Crown 8vo. 5*s.*
Being Vol. XVII. of the International Scientific Series.

KEATING (Mrs.)

**HONOR BLAKE:** The Story of a Plain Woman. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 21*s.*

KAUFMANN (Rev. M.), B.A.

**SOCIALISM:** Its Nature, its Dangers, and its Remedies considered. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

KER (David).

**ON THE ROAD TO KHIVA.** Illustrated with Photographs of the Country and its Inhabitants, and a copy of the Official Map in use during the Campaign, from the Survey of Captain Leusilin. 1 vol. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

KER (David).

**THE BOY SLAVE IN BOKHARA.** A Tale of Central Asia. Crown 8vo. With Illustrations. 5*s.*

One of Henry S. King and Co.'s Five Shilling Books for the Young.

**THE WILD HORSEMAN OF SOUTH AMERICA.** Crown 8vo. Illustrated. 5*s.*

KING (Alice).

**A CLUSTER OF LIVES.** Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

KING (Mrs. Hamilton).

**THE DISCIPLES.** A New Poem. Second Edition, with some Notes. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

**ASPROMONTE, AND OTHER POEMS.** Second Edition. Cloth. 4*s.* 6*d.*

KINGSFORD (Rev. F. W.), M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Stamford Hill; late Chaplain H. E. I. C. (Bengal Presidency).

**HARTHAM CONFERENCES**; or, Discussions upon some of the Religious Topics of the Day. "Audi alteram partem." Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

CONTENTS: The Real Presence—Confession—Ritualism.

KNIGHT (Annette F. C.)

**POEMS.** Fcap. 8vo. Cloth. 5*s.*

LACORDAIRE (Rev. Père).

**LIFE**: Conferences delivered at Toulouse. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

LADY OF LIPARI (The).

A Poem in Three Cantos. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

LAURIE (J. S.), of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law; formerly H.M. Inspector of Schools, England; Assistant Royal Commissioner, Ireland; Special Commissioner, African Settlement; Director of Public Instruction, Ceylon.

**EDUCATIONAL COURSE OF SECULAR SCHOOL BOOKS FOR INDIA.**

*The following Works are now ready:—*

**THE FIRST HINDUSTANI READER.** Stiff linen wrapper, 6*d.*

LAURIE (J. S.)

**THE SECOND HINDUSTANI READER.** Stiff linen wrapper, 6*d.*

**GEOGRAPHY OF INDIA**; with Maps and Historical Appendix, tracing the growth of the British Empire in Hindustan. 128 pp. fcap. 8vo. Cloth. 1*s.* 6*d.*

*In the Press:—*

**ELEMENTARY GEOGRAPHY OF INDIA.**

**FACTS AND FEATURES OF INDIAN HISTORY,** in a series of alternating Reading Lessons and Memory Exercises.

LAYMANN (Captain), Instructor of Tactics at the Military College, Neisse.

**THE FRONTAL ATTACK OF INFANTRY.** Translated by Colonel Edward Newdigate. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

L. D. S.

**LETTERS FROM CHINA AND JAPAN.** 1 vol. Crown 8vo., with Illustrated Title-page. 7*s.* 6*d.*

LEANDER (Richard).

**FANTASTIC STORIES.** Translated from the German by Paulina B. Granville. With Eight full-page Illustrations by M. E. Fraser-Tytler. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

One of Henry S. King and Co.'s Five Shilling Books for the Young.

LEATHES (Rev. Stanley), M.A.

**THE GOSPEL ITS OWN WITNESS.** Being the Hulsean Lectures for 1873. 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

LEE (Rev. Frederick George), D.C.L.

**THE OTHER WORLD**; or, Glimpses of the Supernatural. Being Facts, Records, and Traditions, relating to Dreams, Omens, Miraculous Occurrences, Apparitions, Wraiths, Warnings, Second-sight, Necromancy, Witchcraft, etc. 2 vols. A New Edition. Crown 8vo. 15*s.*

LEE (Holme).

**HER TITLE OF HONOUR.** A Book for Girls. New Edition. Crown 8vo. With a Frontispiece. 5*s.*

LENOIR (J).

**FAYOUM**; or, Artists in Egypt. A Tour with M. Gérome and others. Crown 8vo. With 13 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

LISTADO (J. T.)

**CIVIL SERVICE.** A Novel. 2 vols. Crown 8vo.

LORIMER (Peter), D.D.

**JOHN KNOX AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND:** His work in her Pulpit and his influence upon her Liturgy, Articles, and Parties. Demy 8vo. 12*s.*

LOVER (Samuel), R.H.A.

**THE LIFE OF SAMUEL LOVER, R.H.A.;** Artistic, Literary, and Musical. With Selections from his Unpublished Papers and Correspondence. By Bayle Bernard. 2 vols. Post 8vo. With a Portrait. 21*s.*

LOWER (Mark Antony), M.A., F.S.A.

**WAYSIDE NOTES IN SCANDINAVIA.** Being Notes of Travel in the North of Europe. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

LYONS (R. T.), Assistant-Surgeon, Bengal Army.

**A TREATISE ON RELAPSING FEVER.** Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

MACAULAY (James), M.A., M.D., Edin.

**IRELAND.** A Tour of Observation, with Remarks on Irish Public Questions. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

MAC CARTHY (Denis Florence).

**CALDERON'S DRAMAS.** Translated from the Spanish. Post 8vo. Cloth, gilt edges. 10*s.*

MAC DONALD (George).

**GUTTA-PERCHA WILLIE, THE WORKING GENIUS.** With Nine Illustrations by Arthur Hughes. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

One of Henry S. King and Co.'s Three and Sixpenny Books for the Young.

**MALCOLM.** A Novel. Second Edition. 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

**ST. MICHAEL AND ST. GEORGE.** 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

MAC KENNA (Stephen J.)

**PLUCKY FELLOWS.** A Book for Boys. With Six Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

One of Henry S. King and Co.'s Three and Sixpenny Books for the Young.

MAC KENNA (Stephen J.)

**AT SCHOOL WITH AN OLD DRAGOON.** Crown 8vo. With Six Illustrations. 5*s*.

One of Henry S. King and Co.'s Five Shilling Books for the Young.

MAIR (R. S.), M.D., F.R.C.S.E., late Deputy Coroner of Madras.

**THE MEDICAL GUIDE FOR ANGLO-INDIANS.** Being a Compendium of Advice to Europeans in India, relating to the Preservation and Regulation of Health. With a Supplement on the Management of Children in India. Crown 8vo. Limp cloth. 3*s*. 6*d*.

MANNING (The Most Rev. Archbishop).

**ESSAYS ON RELIGION AND LITERATURE.** By various Writers. Demy 8vo. 10*s*. 6*d*.

CONTENTS:—The Philosophy of Christianity—Mystic Elements of Religion—Controversy with the Agnostics—A Reasoning Thought—Darwinism brought to Book—Mr. Mill on Liberty of the Press—Christianity in relation to Society—The Religious Condition of Germany—The Philosophy of Bacon—Catholic Laymen and Scholastic Philosophy.

MAREY (E. J.)

**ANIMAL MECHANICS.** A Treatise on Terrestrial and Aerial Locomotion. Second Edition. With 117 Illustrations. 5*s*.

Volume XI. of the International Scientific Series.

MARRIOTT (Maj.-Gen. W. F.), C.S.I.

**A GRAMMAR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.** Crown 8vo. 6*s*.

MARSHALL (Hamilton).

**THE STORY OF SIR EDWARD'S WIFE.** A Novel. 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 10*s*. 6*d*.

MARZIALS (Theophile).

**THE GALLERY OF PIGEONS,** and other Poems. Crown 8vo. 4*s*. 6*d*.

MARKEWITCH (B.)

**THE NEGLECTED QUESTION.** Translated from the Russian, by the Princess Ourousoff, and dedicated by Express Permission to Her Imperial and Royal Highness Marie Alexandrovna, the Duchess of Edinburgh. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 14*s*.

MASTERMAN (J.)

**HALF-A-DOZEN DAUGHTERS.** Crown 8vo. With a Frontispiece. 3*s.* 6*d.*
This is one of the Cornhill Library of Fiction.

MAUDSLEY (Dr. Henry).

**RESPONSIBILITY IN MENTAL DISEASE.** Second Edition. 5*s.*
Vol. VIII. of the International Scientific Series.

MAURICE (C. Edmund).

**LIVES OF ENGLISH POPULAR LEADERS.** No. 1.—STEPHEN LANGTON. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*
No. 2.—TYLER, BALL, and OLDCASTLE. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

MAUGHAN (William Charles).

**THE ALPS OF ARABIA**; or, Travels through Egypt, Sinai, Arabia, and the Holy Land. Demy 8vo. With Map. 5*s.*

MEDLEY (Lieut.-Col. J. G.), Royal Engineers.

**AN AUTUMN TOUR IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.** Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

MENZIES (Sutherland).

**POLITICAL WOMEN.** 2 vols. Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

MICKLETHWAITE (J. T.), F.S.A.

**MODERN PARISH CHURCHES**: Their Plan, Design, and Furniture. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

MIRUS (Major-General von).

**CAVALRY FIELD DUTY.** Translated by Captain Frank S. Russell, 14th (King's) Hussars. Crown 8vo. Cloth limp. 7*s.* 6*d.*
This work is one of Henry S. King and Co.'s Military Series.

MOORE (Rev. Daniel), M.A.

**CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH.** A Course of Lent Lectures, delivered in the Parish Church of Holy Trinity, Paddington. By the author of "The Age and the Gospel: Hulsean Lectures," etc. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

MOORE (Rev. Thomas), Vicar of Christ Church, Chesham.

**SERMONETTES**: on Synonymous Texts, taken from the Bible and Book of Common Prayer, for the Study, Family Reading, and Private Devotion. Small Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

MORELL (J. R.)

**EUCLID SIMPLIFIED IN METHOD AND LANGUAGE.** Being a Manual of Geometry on the French System. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

MORLEY (Susan).

**AILEEN FERRERS.** A Novel. 2 vols. Crown 8vo.

**THROSTLETHWAITE.** 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

MOSTYN (Sydney).

**PERPLEXITY.** A Novel. 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

NAAKE (John T.), of the British Museum.

**SLAVONIC FAIRY TALES.** From Russian, Servian, Polish, and Bohemian Sources. With Four Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

NEWMAN (John Henry), D.D.

**CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE WRITINGS OF DR. J. H. NEWMAN.** Being Selections, Personal, Historical, Philosophical, and Religious, from his various Works. Arranged with the Author's personal approval. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. With Portrait. 6*s.*

NEWMAN (Mrs.)

**TOO LATE.** A Novel. 2 vols. Crown 8vo.

NOBLE (James Ashcroft).

**THE PELICAN PAPERS.** Reminiscences and Remains of a Dweller in the Wilderness. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

NORMAN PEOPLE (The).

**THE NORMAN PEOPLE,** and their Existing Descendants in the British Dominions and the United States of America. One handsome volume. 8vo. 21*s.*

NORRIS (Rev. A.)

**THE INNER AND OUTER LIFE POEMS.** Fcap. 8vo. 6*s.*

NOTREGE (John), A.M.

**THE SPIRITUAL FUNCTION OF A PRESBYTER IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.** Crown 8vo. Red edges. 3*s.* 6*d.*

ORIENTAL SPORTING MAGAZINE (The).

**THE ORIENTAL SPORTING MAGAZINE.** A Reprint of the first 5 Volumes, in 2 Volumes. Demy 8vo. 28*s.*

PAGE (H. A.)

**NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE, A MEMOIR OF**, with Stories now first published in this country. Large post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

PAGE (Capt. S. Flood).

**DISCIPLINE AND DRILL.** Four Lectures delivered to the London Scottish Rifle Volunteers. Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 1*s.*

PALGRAVE (W. Gifford).

**HERMANN AGHA.** An Eastern Narrative. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. Cloth, extra gilt. 18*s.*

PARKER (Joseph), D.D.

**THE PARACLETE:** An Essay on the Personality and Ministry of the Holy Ghost, with some reference to current discussions. Demy 8vo. 12*s.*

PARR (Harriett).

**ECHOES OF A FAMOUS YEAR.** Crown 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

PAUL (C. Kegan).

**GOETHE'S FAUST.** A New Translation in Rime. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

**WILLIAM GODWIN:** Autobiography, Memoir, and Correspondence. 2 vols. Demy 8vo.

PAYNE (John).

**SONGS OF LIFE AND DEATH.** Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

PAYNE (Professor).

**LECTURES ON EDUCATION.** 6*d.* each.

I. Pestalozzi: the Influence of His Principles and Practice. [*Just Published.*
II. Fröbel and the Kindergarten System. Second Edition.
III. The Science and Art of Education.
IV. The True Foundation of Science Teaching.

PELLETAN (Eugène).

**THE DESERT PASTOR, JEAN JAROUSSEAU.** Translated from the French. By Colonel E. P. De L'Hoste. With an Engraved Frontispiece. Fcap. 8vo. New Edition. 3*s.* 6*d.*

PENRICE (Major J.), B.A.

**A DICTIONARY AND GLOSSARY OF THE KOR-AN.** With copious Grammatical References and Explanations of the Text. 4to. 21*s.*

PERRIER (Amelia).

**A WINTER IN MOROCCO.** With Four Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

**A GOOD MATCH.** A Novel. 2 vols. Crown 8vo.

PERCEVAL (Rev. P.)

**TAMIL PROVERBS, WITH THEIR ENGLISH TRANSLATION.** Containing upwards of Six Thousand Proverbs. Third Edition. 8vo. Sewed. 9*s.*

PESCHEL (Dr.)

**MANKIND**: A Scientific Study of the Races and Distribution of Man, considered in their Bodily Variations, Languages, Occupations, and Religions.

PETTIGREW (J. B.), M.D., F.R.S.

**ANIMAL LOCOMOTION**; or, Walking, Swimming, and Flying. Second Edition. With 119 Illustrations. 5*s.*
Volume VII. of the International Scientific Series.

PIGGOT (John), F.S.A, F.R.G.S.

**PERSIA—ANCIENT AND MODERN.** Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

POUSHKIN (Alexander Serguevitch).

**RUSSIAN ROMANCE.** Translated from the Tales of Belkin, etc. By Mrs. J. Buchan Telfer (*née* Mouravieff). Cr. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

POWER (Harriet).

**OUR INVALIDS: HOW SHALL WE EMPLOY AND AMUSE THEM?** Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

POWLETT (Lieut. Norton), Royal Artillery.

**EASTERN LEGENDS AND STORIES IN ENGLISH VERSE.** Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

PROCTOR (R. A.), B.A.

**THE EXPANSE OF HEAVEN.** A Series of Essays on the Wonders of the Firmament. With a Frontispiece. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

RANKING (B. Montgomerie).

**STREAMS FROM HIDDEN SOURCES.** Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

## READY-MONEY MORTIBOY.

**READY-MONEY MORTIBOY.** A Matter-of-Fact Story. Crown 8vo. With frontispiece. 3*s.* 6*d.*
This is one of the volumes of the Cornhill Library of Fiction.

## REANEY (Mrs. G. S.)

**WAKING AND WORKING; OR, FROM GIRLHOOD TO WOMANHOOD.** With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*
One of Henry S. King and Co.'s Five Shilling Books for the Young.

**SUNBEAM WILLIE, AND OTHER STORIES,** for Home Reading and Cottage Meetings. Small square, uniform with "Lost Gip," etc. 3 Illustrations. 1*s.* 6*d.*

## REGINALD BRAMBLE.

**REGINALD BRAMBLE.** A Cynic of the Nineteenth Century. An Autobiography. 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

## REID (T. Wemyss).

**CABINET PORTRAITS.** Biographical Sketches of Statesmen of the Day. 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

## RHOADES (James).

**TIMOLEON.** A Dramatic Poem. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

## RIBOT (Professor Th.)

**CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH PSYCHOLOGY.** Large post 8vo. 9*s.*
An analysis of the views and opinions of the following metaphysicians, as expressed in their writings:—James Mill, Alexander Bain, John Stuart Mill, George H. Lewes, Herbert Spencer, Samuel Bailey.

**HEREDITY:** A Psychological Study on its Phenomena, its Laws, its Causes, and its Consequences. 1 vol. Large crown 8vo. 9*s.*

## ROBERTSON (The Late Rev. F. W.), M.A.

**THE LATE REV. F. W. ROBERTSON, M.A., LIFE AND LETTERS OF.** Edited by the Rev. Stopford Brooke, M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.
I. 2 vols., uniform with the Sermons. With Steel Portrait. 7*s.* 6*d.*
II. Library Edition, in Demy 8vo. with Two Steel Portraits. 12*s.*
III. A Popular Edition, in 1 vol. 6*s.*

ROBERTSON (The Late Rev. F. W.), M.A.

*New and Cheaper Editions :—*

**SERMONS.**

Vol. I. Small crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*
Vol. II. Small crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*
Vol. III. Small crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*
Vol. IV. Small crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**EXPOSITORY LECTURES ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.** Small crown 8vo. 5*s.*

**AN ANALYSIS OF MR. TENNYSON'S "IN MEMORIAM."** (Dedicated by Permission to the Poet-Laureate.) Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.*

**THE EDUCATION OF THE HUMAN RACE.** Translated from the German of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

*The above Works can also be had bound in half morocco.*

*** A Portrait of the late Rev. F. W. Robertson, mounted for framing, can be had, price 2*s.* 6*d.*

ROSS (Mrs. Ellen), ("Nelsie Brook.")

**DADDY'S PET.** A Sketch from Humble Life. Square crown 8vo. Uniform with "Lost Gip." With Six Illustrations. 1*s.*

RUSSELL (William Clark).

**MEMOIRS OF MRS. LÆTITIA BOOTHBY.** Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

RUSSELL (E. R.)

**IRVING AS HAMLET.** Demy 8vo. Second Edition. Sewed. 1*s.*

SADLER (S. W.), R.N., Author of "Marshall Vavasour."

**THE AFRICAN CRUISER.** A Midshipman's Adventures on the West Coast. A Book for Boys. With Three Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

One of Henry S. King and Co.'s Three and Sixpenny Books for the Young.

SAMAROW (Gregor).

**FOR SCEPTRE AND CROWN.** A Romance of the Present Time. Translated by Fanny Wormald. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 15*s.*

SAUNDERS (Katherine).

**THE HIGH MILLS.** A Novel. 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

SAUNDERS (Katherine).

**GIDEON'S ROCK**, and other Stories. 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 6*s*.

**JOAN MERRYWEATHER**, and other Stories. 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 6*s*.

**MARGARET AND ELIZABETH.** A Story of the Sea. 1 vol. Crown 8vo. 6*s*.

SAUNDERS (John).

**HIRELL.** Crown 8vo. With Frontispiece. 3*s*. 6*d*.

**ABEL DRAKE'S WIFE.** Crown 8vo. With Frontispiece. 3*s*. 6*d*.

These works form separate volumes of the Cornhill Library of Fiction.

**ISRAEL MORT, OVERMAN.** The Story of the Mine. 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

SCHELL (Major von).

**THE OPERATIONS OF THE FIRST ARMY UNDER GEN. VON GOEBEN.** Translated by Col. C. H. von Wright. Four Maps. Demy 8vo. 9*s*.

**THE OPERATIONS OF THE FIRST ARMY UNDER GEN. VON STEINMETZ.** Translated by Captain E. O. Hollist. Demy 8vo. 10*s*. 6*d*.

These works form separate volumes of Henry S. King and Co.'s Military Series.

SCHERFF (Major W. von).

**STUDIES IN THE NEW INFANTRY TACTICS.** Parts I. and II. Translated from the German by Colonel Lumley Graham. Demy 8vo. 7*s*. 6*d*.

This work is one of Henry S. King and Co.'s Military Series.

SCHMIDT (Prof. Oscar), Strasburg University.

**THE DOCTRINE OF DESCENT AND DARWINISM.** Second Edition. 26 Illustrations. 5*s*.

Being Vol. XII. of the International Scientific Series.

**HANDBOOK OF COMPARATIVE ANATOMY.** Crown 8vo.

SCOTT (Patrick).

**THE DREAM AND THE DEED**, and other Poems. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s*.

SEEKING HIS FORTUNE, and other Stories.

**SEEKING HIS FORTUNE**, and other Stories. Crown 8vo. With Four Illustrations. 3*s*. 6*d*.

One of Henry S. King and Co.'s Three and Sixpenny Books for the Young.

SENIOR (Nassau William).

**ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE.** Correspondence and Conversations with Nassau W. Senior, from 1833 to 1859. Edited by M. C. M. Simpson. 2 vols. Large post 8vo. 21*s*.

**JOURNALS KEPT IN FRANCE AND ITALY.** From 1848 to 1852. With a Sketch of the Revolution of 1848. Edited by his Daughter, M. C. M. Simpson. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 24*s*.

SEVEN AUTUMN LEAVES.

**SEVEN AUTUMN LEAVES FROM FAIRYLAND.** Illustrated with 9 Etchings. Square crown 8vo. 5*s*.

SHADWELL (Major-General), C.B.

**MOUNTAIN WARFARE.** Illustrated by the Campaign of 1799 in Switzerland. Being a Translation of the Swiss Narrative compiled from the Works of the Archduke Charles, Jomini, and others. Also of Notes by General H. Dufour on the Campaign of the Valtelline in 1635. With Appendix, Maps, and Introductory Remarks. Demy 8vo. 16*s*.

SHELDON (Philip).

**WOMAN'S A RIDDLE**; or, Baby Warmstrey. A Novel. 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

SHERMAN (Gen. W. T.)

**MEMOIRS OF GEN. W. T. SHERMAN**, Commander of the Federal Forces in the American Civil War. By Himself. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. With Map. 24*s*. *Copyright English Edition.*

SHELLEY (Lady).

**SHELLEY MEMORIALS FROM AUTHENTIC SOURCES.** With (now first printed) an Essay on Christianity by Percy Bysshe Shelley. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. With Portrait. 5*s*.

## Shipley (Rev. Orby), M.A.

**STUDIES IN MODERN PROBLEMS.** First Series. By various Writers. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

Contents.

Sacramental Confession.
Abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles. Part I.
The Sanctity of Marriage.
Creation and Modern Science.
Retreats for Persons Living in the World.
Catholic and Protestant.
The Bishops on Confession in the Church of England.

**STUDIES IN MODERN PROBLEMS.** Second Series. By various Writers. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

Contents.

Some Principles of Christian Ceremonial.
A Layman's View of Confession of Sin to a Priest. Parts I. and II.
Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament.
Missions and Preaching Orders.
Abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles. Part II.
The First Liturgy of Edward VI. and our own office contrasted and compared.

## Smedley (M. B.)

**BOARDING-OUT AND PAUPER SCHOOLS FOR GIRLS.** Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

## Smith (Edward) M.D., LL.B., F.R.S.

**HEALTH AND DISEASE,** as influenced by the Daily, Seasonal, and other Cyclical Changes in the Human System. A New Edition. 7*s.* 6*d.*

**FOODS.** Third Edition. Profusely Illustrated. 5*s.*
Volume III. of the International Scientific Series.

**PRACTICAL DIETARY FOR FAMILIES, SCHOOLS, AND THE LABOURING CLASSES.** A New Edition. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**CONSUMPTION IN ITS EARLY AND REMEDIABLE STAGES.** A New Edition. 7*s.* 6*d.*

## Songs for Music.

**SONGS FOR MUSIC.** By Four Friends. Square crown 8vo. 5*s.*
Containing Songs by Reginald A. Gatty, Stephen H. Gatty, Greville J. Chester, and Juliana H. Ewing.

## Smith (Hubert).

**TENT LIFE WITH ENGLISH GIPSIES IN NORWAY.** With Five full-page Engravings and Thirty-one smaller Illustrations by Whymper and others, and Map of the Country showing Routes. Second Edition. Revised and Corrected. 8vo. 21*s.*

SOME TIME IN IRELAND.

**SOME TIME IN IRELAND.** A Recollection. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

SONGS OF TWO WORLDS.

**SONGS OF TWO WORLDS.** By a New Writer. First Series. Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

**SONGS OF TWO WORLDS.** By a New Writer. Second Series. Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

**SONGS OF TWO WORLDS.** By a New Writer. Third Series. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

SPENCER (HERBERT).

**THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY.** Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s.* Volume V. of the International Scientific Series.

STEVENSON (Rev. W. Fleming).

**HYMNS FOR THE CHURCH AND HOME.** Selected and Edited by the Rev. W. Fleming Stevenson.

The most complete Hymn Book published.

The Hymn Book consists of Three Parts:—I. For Public Worship.—II. For Family and Private Worship.—III. For Children.

*** *Published in various forms and prices, the latter ranging from* 8*d. to* 6*s. Lists and full particulars will be furnished on application to the Publishers.*

STEWART (Professor Balfour).

**ON THE CONSERVATION OF ENERGY.** Third Edition. With Fourteen Engravings. 5*s.*

Volume VI. of the International Scientific Series.

STRETTON (Hesba). Author of "Jessica's First Prayer."

**CASSY.** Twenty-first Thousand. With Six Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

**THE KING'S SERVANTS.** With Eight Illustrations. Twenty-sixth Thousand. Square crown 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

**LOST GIP.** Thirty-eighth Thousand. With Six Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

*** *Also a handsomely-bound Edition, with Twelve Illustrations, price* 2*s.* 6*d.*

STRETTON (Hesba).

**THE WONDERFUL LIFE.** Seventh Thousand. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

**HESTER MORLEY'S PROMISE.** 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

**THE DOCTOR'S DILEMMA.** 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

**THE STORM OF LIFE.**

STUBBS (Major Francis W.), Royal (late Bengal) Artillery.

**THE REGIMENT OF BENGAL ARTILLERY**: The History of its Organization, Equipment, and War Services. With Maps and Plans. 2 vols. 8vo. [*Preparing.*

SULLY (James).

**SENSATION AND INTUITION.** Demy 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

TAYLOR (Rev. J. W. Augustus), M.A.

**POEMS.** Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

TAYLOR (Colonel Meadows), C.S.I., M.R.I.A.

**SEETA.** A Novel. 3 vols.

**THE CONFESSIONS OF A THUG.**

**TARA**: a Mahratta Tale.

**RALPH DARNELL.**

**TIPPOO SULTAN.**

**A NOBLE QUEEN.** 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

New and Cheaper Edition in one vol. crown 8vo. with Frontispiece. Each 6*s.*

TENNYSON (Alfred).

**QUEEN MARY.** A Drama. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

TENNYSON'S (Alfred) Works. Cabinet Edition. Ten Volumes. Each with Portrait. 2*s.* 6*d.*

CABINET EDITION. 10 vols. Complete in handsome Ornamental Case. 28*s.*

TENNYSON'S (Alfred) Works. Author's Edition. Complete in Five Volumes. Cloth gilt, 6*s.* each; half-morocco, Roxburgh style, 7*s.* 6*d.* each.

VOL. I.
**EARLY POEMS, and ENGLISH IDYLLS.**

VOL. II.
**LOCKSLEY HALL, LUCRETIUS, and other Poems.**

VOL. III.
**THE IDYLLS OF THE KING** (*Complete*).

VOL. IV.
**THE PRINCESS, and MAUD.**

VOL. V.
**ENOCH ARDEN, and IN MEMORIAM.**

---

**TENNYSON'S IDYLLS OF THE KING,** and other Poems. Illustrated by Julia Margaret Cameron. 1 vol. Folio. Half-bound morocco, cloth sides. Six Guineas.

TENNYSON'S (Alfred) Works. Original Editions.

**POEMS.** Small 8vo. 6*s.*

**MAUD,** and other Poems. Small 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**THE PRINCESS.** Small 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**IDYLLS OF THE KING.** Small 8vo. 5*s.*

**IDYLLS OF THE KING.** Collected. Small 8vo. 7*s.*

**THE HOLY GRAIL,** and other Poems. Small 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

**GARETH AND LYNETTE.** Small 8vo. 3*s.*

**ENOCH ARDEN,** etc. Small 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**SELECTIONS FROM THE ABOVE WORKS.** Square 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* Cloth gilt, extra, 4*s.*

**SONGS FROM THE ABOVE WORKS.** Square 8vo. Cloth extra, 3*s.* 6*d.*

**IN MEMORIAM.** Small 8vo. 4*s.*

**LIBRARY EDITION.** In 6 vols. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* each.

**POCKET VOLUME EDITION.** 11 vols. In neat case, 31*s.* 6*d.*

Ditto, ditto. Extra cloth gilt, in case, 35*s.*

**POEMS.** Illustrated Edition. 4to. 25*s.*

THOMAS (Moy).

**A FIGHT FOR LIFE.** Crown 8vo. With Frontispiece. 3*s.* 6*d.* This is one of the volumes of the Cornhill Library of Fiction.

THOMSON (J. T.), F.R.G.S.

**HAKAYIT ABDULLA.** The Autobiography of a Malay Munshi, between the years 1808 and 1843. Demy 8vo. 12*s.*

THOMPSON (A. C.)

**PRELUDES.** A Volume of Poems. Illustrated by Elizabeth Thompson (Painter of "The Roll Call"). 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

THOMPSON (Rev. A. S.), British Chaplain at St. Petersburg.

**HOME WORDS FOR WANDERERS.** A Volume of Sermons. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

THOUGHTS IN VERSE. Small crown 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

THRING (Rev. Godfrey), B.A.

**HYMNS AND SACRED LYRICS.** 1 vol. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

TODD (Herbert), M.A.

**ARVAN**; or, The Story of the Sword. A Poem. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

TRAHERNE (Mrs. Arthur).

**THE ROMANTIC ANNALS OF A NAVAL FAMILY.** Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

TRAVERS (Mar.)

**THE SPINSTERS OF BLATCHINGTON.** A Novel. 2 vols. Crown 8vo.

TREVANDRUM OBSERVATIONS.

**OBSERVATIONS OF MAGNETIC DECLINATION MADE AT TREVANDRUM AND AGUSTIA MALLEY** in the Observatories of his Highness the Maharajah of Travancore, G.C.S.I., in the Years 1852 to 1860. Being Trevandrum Magnetical Observations, Volume I. Discussed and Edited by John Allan Brown, F.R.S., late Director of the Observatories. With an Appendix. Imp. 4to. Cloth. £3 3*s.*

*** *The Appendix, containing Reports on the Observatories and on the Public Museum, Public Park, and Gardens at Trevandrum, pp.* xii.-116, *may be had separately.* 21*s.*

TURNER (Rev. Charles).

**SONNETS, LYRICS, AND TRANSLATIONS.** Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

TYNDALL (J.), LL.D., F.R.S.

**THE FORMS OF WATER IN CLOUDS AND RIVERS, ICE AND GLACIERS.** With Twenty-six Illustrations. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

Volume I. of the International Scientific Series.

UMBRA OXONIENSIS.

**RESULTS OF THE EXPOSTULATION OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE W. E. GLADSTONE,** in their Relation to the Unity of Roman Catholicism. Large fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

UPTON (Roger D.), Captain late 9th Royal Lancers.

**NEWMARKET AND ARABIA.** An Examination of the Descent of Racers and Coursers. With Pedigrees and Frontispiece. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

VAMBERY (Prof. Arminius), of the University of Pesth.

**BOKHARA:** Its History and Conquest. Demy 8vo. 18*s.*

VANESSA. By the Author of "Thomasina," etc. A Novel. Second Edition. 2 vols. Crown 8vo.

VAUGHAN (Rev. C. J.), D.D.

**WORDS OF HOPE FROM THE PULPIT OF THE TEMPLE CHURCH.** Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

**THE SOLIDITY OF TRUE RELIGION,** and other Sermons Preached in London during the Election and Mission Week, February, 1874. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**FORGET THINE OWN PEOPLE.** An Appeal for Missions. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**THE YOUNG LIFE EQUIPPING ITSELF FOR GOD'S SERVICE.** Being Four Sermons Preached before the University of Cambridge, in November, 1872. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

VINCENT (Capt. C. E. H.), late Royal Welsh Fusiliers.

**ELEMENTARY MILITARY GEOGRAPHY, RECONNOITRING, AND SKETCHING.** Compiled for Non-Commissioned Officers and Soldiers of all Arms. Square crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

**RUSSIA'S ADVANCE EASTWARD.** Based on the Official Reports of Lieutenant Hugo Stumm, German Military Attaché to the Khivan Expedition. With Map. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

VIZCAYA; or, Life in the Land of the Carlists.

**VIZCAYA**; or, Life in the Land of the Carlists at the Outbreak of the Insurrection, with some Account of the Iron Mines and other Characteristics of the Country. With a Map and Eight Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 9*s*.

VOGEL (Prof.), Polytechnic Academy of Berlin.

**THE CHEMICAL EFFECTS OF LIGHT AND PHOTOGRAPHY**, in their application to Art, Science, and Industry. Second Edition. With 100 Illustrations, including some beautiful Specimens of Photography. 5*s*.

Volume XV. of the International Scientific Series.

VYNER (Lady Mary).

**EVERY DAY A PORTION.** Adapted from the Bible and the Prayer Book, for the Private Devotions of those living in Widowhood. Collected and Edited by Lady Mary Vyner. Square crown 8vo. Elegantly bound. 5*s*.

WAITING FOR TIDINGS.

**WAITING FOR TIDINGS.** By the Author of "White and Black." 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

WEDMORE (Frederick).

**TWO GIRLS.** 2 vols. Crown 8vo.

WARTENSLEBEN (Count Hermann von), Colonel in the Prussian General Staff.

**THE OPERATIONS OF THE SOUTH ARMY IN JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1871.** Compiled from the Official War Documents of the Head-quarters of the Southern Army. Translated by Colonel C. H. von Wright. With Maps. Demy 8vo. 6*s*.

**THE OPERATIONS OF THE FIRST ARMY UNDER GEN. VON MANTEUFFEL.** Translated by Colonel C. H. von Wright. Uniform with the above. Demy 8vo. 9*s*.

These works form separate volumes of Henry S. King and Co.'s Military Series.

WELLS (Captain John C.), R.N.

**SPITZBERGEN—THE GATEWAY TO THE POLYNIA**; or, A Voyage to Spitzbergen. With numerous Illustrations by Whymper and others, and Map. 8vo. 21*s*.

WHAT 'TIS TO LOVE. By the Author of "Flora Adair," "The Value of Fostertown." 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

WHITNEY (William Dwight). Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Yale College, New Haven.

**THE LIFE AND GROWTH OF LANGUAGE.** Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s*. *Copyright Edition.*
Volume XVI. of the International Scientific Series.

WHITTLE (J. Lowry), A.M., Trin. Coll., Dublin.

**CATHOLICISM AND THE VATICAN.** With a Narrative of the Old Catholic Congress at Munich. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 4*s*. 6*d*.

WILBERFORCE (Henry W.)

**THE CHURCH AND THE EMPIRES.** Historical Periods. Preceded by a Memoir of the Author by John Henry Newman, D.D., of the Oratory. With Portrait. Post 8vo. 10*s*. 6*d*.

WILKINSON (T. Lean).

**SHORT LECTURES ON THE LAND LAWS.** Delivered before the Working Men's College. Crown 8vo. 2*s*.

WILLIAMS (Rev. Rowland), D.D.

**LIFE AND LETTERS OF ROWLAND WILLIAMS, D.D.,** with Selections from his Note-books. Edited by Mrs. Rowland Williams. With a Photographic Portrait. 2 vols. Large post 8vo. 24*s*.

WILSON (H. Schütz).

**STUDIES AND ROMANCES.** Crown 8vo. 7*s*. 6*d*.

WILLOUGHBY (The Hon. Mrs.)

**ON THE NORTH WIND—THISTLEDOWN.** A Volume of Poems. Elegantly bound. Small crown 8vo. 7*s*. 6*d*.

WINTERBOTHAM (Rev. R.), M.A., B.Sc.

**SERMONS AND EXPOSITIONS.** Crown 8vo. 7*s*. 6*d*.

WOOD (C. F.)

**A YACHTING CRUISE IN THE SOUTH SEAS.** Demy 8vo. With Six Photographic Illustrations. 7*s*. 6*d*.

WRIGHT (Rev. W.), of Stoke Bishop, Bristol.

**MAN AND ANIMALS:** A Sermon. Crown 8vo. Stitched in wrapper. 1*s*.

**WAITING FOR THE LIGHT, AND OTHER SERMONS.** Cloth elegant binding. Crown 8vo. 6*s*.

WYLD (R. S.), F.R.S.E.

**THE PHYSICS AND PHILOSOPHY OF THE SENSES**; or, The Mental and the Physical in their Mutual Relation. Illustrated by several Plates. Demy 8vo. 16*s.*

YONGE (C. D.), Regius Professor, Queen's College, Belfast.

**HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION OF 1688.** Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

YOUMANS (Eliza A.)

**AN ESSAY ON THE CULTURE OF THE OBSERVING POWERS OF CHILDREN**, especially in connection with the Study of Botany. Edited, with Notes and a Supplement, by Joseph Payne, F.C.P., Author of "Lectures on the Science and Art of Education," etc. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

**FIRST BOOK OF BOTANY.** Designed to cultivate the Observing Powers of Children. With 300 Engravings. New and Enlarged Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

ZIMMERN (Helen).

**STORIES IN PRECIOUS STONES.** With Six Illustrations. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

# FORTHCOMING WORKS.

**SIR THOMAS MUNRO, BART., K.C.B.**, sometime Governor of Madras. A Selection from his Minutes and other Official Writings. Edited by Sir Alexander Arbuthnot.

**DANTE AND BEATRICE FROM 1282 TO 1290.** A Romance. By Roxburghe Lothian. 1 vol. Post 8vo. Cloth.

**EDWIN THE FAIR AND ISAAC COMMENUS.** By Sir Henry Taylor. Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**A SICILIAN SUMMER, AND OTHER POEMS.** By Sir Henry Taylor. Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

**MYTHS AND SONGS OF THE SOUTH PACIFIC.** By the Rev. W. W. Gill. 1 vol. Post 8vo.

**WILLIAM AUGUSTUS, DUKE OF CUMBERLAND.** Being a sketch of Military Life and Character, chiefly as exhibited in the general orders of H.R.H., 1745–1747. By Archibald Neil Campbell Maclachlan, M.A., Vicar of Newton Valence, Hants; author of "Napoleon at Fontainebleau and Elba." With Memoir of Major-Gen. Sir Neil Campbell, C.B., etc. Post 8vo. With 2 Steel Engraved Plates.

**MINOR CHORDS; OR, SONGS FOR THE SUFFERING.** By the Rev. Basil Edwards. Fcap 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* Paper, 2*s.* 6*d.*

**SIR THOMAS ELYOT'S "GOVERNOUR."** A reprint of the original edition, revised and corrected, with notes, and a life of the author. By Herbert Croft, Barrister-at-Law.

No complete reprint of the above work is known to exist.

**MY SISTER ROSALIND.** By the author of "Christina North." A Novel. 2 vols.

**ALDYTH.** A Novel. By the Author of "Healey." 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

**IDA CRAVEN.** A Novel. By Mrs. M. H. Cadell. 3 vols. Crown 8vo.

**CLEVEDEN.** A Novel. By Stephen Yorke, Author of "Tales of the North Riding." 2 vols. Crown 8vo.

**TOO LONG UNTOLD**, and other Stories. By Katherine Saunders. 2 vols. Crown 8vo.

CONTENTS:—Too Long Untold—The Harpers of Men-y-don—Ida's Story—Little Missy—The Shaken Nest.

**UNFOLDINGS OF CHRISTIAN HOPE.** An Essay showing that the Doctrine contained in the Damnatory Clauses of the Creed commonly called Athanasian is unscriptural. By Presbyter. Small crown 8vo. Cloth. 4*s.* 6*d.*

*Caxton Printing Works, Beccles.*

3 2044 038 387 288